

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1326100

BT
113
L44
1854



The Library
of the
School of Theology
at Claremont

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711

BT
113
L44
1854

\$85⁰⁰

DISCUSSION

OF THE

DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY,

BETWEEN

LUTHER LEE, WESLEYAN MINISTER,

AND

SAMUEL J. MAY, UNITARIAN, MINISTER.

REPORTED BY LUCIUS C. MATLACK.

SYRACUSE, N. Y.:
PUBLISHED AT THE WESLEYAN BOOK ROOM,
No. 60 SOUTH SALINA STREET,
1854

DISCUSSION

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

AT CLAREMONT

California

DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

BY JESSE C. WOODS

LUTHER PER MARLBOROUGH MINISTERIAL

1864

STUDY LIBRARY, MARLBOROUGH, MASSACHUSETTS

LIBRARY OF THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PURCHASED BY THE STANFORD LIBRARIES
NO. 43 BOOKS FOR STUDY

1881

DISCUSSION

BY LUTHER LEE AND SAMUEL J. MAY.

COMMENCED FEBRUARY 28, 1854.

FIRST EVENING

By consent of the parties, C. T. Longstreet, Esq., of Syracuse, was called on to preside. An immense audience filled the City Hall—hundreds being unable to get in. The meeting was opened with prayer by Rev. Mr. May.

MR. LEE'S FIRST SPEECH.

MR. CHAIRMAN, AND RESPECTED AUDITORS:—It is with a profound, and even oppressive sense of responsibility, that I rise to open this discussion, between my friend, Rev. Mr. May, and myself. This deep and moving feeling of my heart, does not arise simply from the fact that my friend, in this discussion my opponent, and I, differ in opinion. We all probably differ on some questions. It is the lot of mankind to differ, and always has been.

Nor is it the simple fact that we have agreed to discuss our differences before this intelligent audience, that burdens me with so deep a sense of responsibility. There is nothing to be feared from discussion. My friend on the other side would not harm me if he could; and you, intelligent and benevolent auditors, would not harm me, even should I be found in error, and defeated at the close of the discussion. I should still have the pity of all good people, and sustain no loss but the loss of my errors, which loss would be a gain to heaven and earth.

To come to the point; it is the nature of the subject we have agreed to discuss, that causes my heart to beat slow and solemn, under an oppressive weight of responsibility.

The great question involves the being of God that made us both; whom we both profess to worship and adore. It concerns the mode of his existence, and affects the worship we offer to him. It concerns the character of our Lord

Jesus Christ, in whom we trust for redemption. It raises the question Is he God? or man? or both? or neither? What is he in whom we trust; who is the only "name given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved." It raises the question, What is the Holy Ghost? upon whose power we rely to renew our hearts, to sanctify our spirits, and to comfort and guide us through our earthly pilgrimage, to that rest that remaineth to the people of God. The question is raised, Is this Holy Ghost, God? or a created being? or something else? What is the Holy Ghost?

It will be seen at a glance, that the affirmatives and negatives of the points involved in the issue, embrace conclusions sufficiently wide from each other, to form the basis of distinct and widely different systems of religion. The fact cannot be disguised—my friend on the other side, or myself, must be fundamentally wrong. If he preaches the true gospel, I do not; and if I preach the true gospel he does not. If his religion is true Christianity, mine must be a system of idolatry. And if my religion is true Christianity, his cannot be, nor can those who embrace it be saved, unless they are saved by the power of the truths they reject, to which heaven being willing, I will not object.

It is then a solemn work to discuss these momentous questions. After I have spent the prime of life, and most of the strength of my manhood, until my head is grey with the frost of more than half a century, in preaching what I have honestly believed to be the gospel of the grace God; and have baptized hundreds into the same faith; I come here and lay it all down between me and my friend on the other side, to be taken up and discussed between us as a question yet unsettled.

The question agreed upon to be discussed reads thus :

" There is but one living and true God, everlasting, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of the Godhead there are three persons of one substance, power and eternity ; the Father, the Son, [the Word] and the Holy Ghost."

The first part of this article I understand is admitted by both parties to the discussion. The second part, commencing with the affirmation that " there are three persons in unity of the Godhead," is the real question in debate. Of this I have the affirmative, and my friend the negative. As I have the case to make out I shall attempt to prove

1. The essential, underived divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ,—the Son or Word.

2. The divinity of the Holy Ghost, and his personality.

3. The unity of the two with the Father, in the Godhead.

In proof of the Deity, or underived Divinity of Christ, I offer the following arguments.

I. All the names and titles which God has appropriated to himself, are accredited to Christ. I will commence with the name, God.

This is the first name by which God is known in the Scriptures. " In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Gen. i. 1.

With this title the Deity is presented to the notice of mankind, at the opening of the book of religious truth. And this expressive and emphatic title is most explicitly applied to Jesus Christ. To prove this I refer you first to a plain declaration of the old Testament Scriptures which is afterwards applied to him by the Apostle Paul.

" Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." Psa. xlvi. 6. This is applied to Christ, Heb. i. 8. " Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne O God is for ever and ever."

To avoid the force of this text which is so clearly in point, it is rendered by a different translation so as to read—God is thy throne for ever and ever." But to this verbal criticism, there are three serious and fatal objections, which compel us to abide by the word of God as it is here given in our translation, and already quoted.

1. There is no parallel case to give it countenance.

2. It makes no sense ; God is not and cannot be a throne.

3. To make God the throne of a creature would be absurd and false, if not blasphemous.

Again. We have a most remarkable declaration in the old Testament giving the title " Mighty God" to Jesus Christ.

" For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given ; and the government shall be upon his shoulder ; add his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." Isa. ix. 6

This clearly refers to Christ because

1. The context is applied to Christ.

The first and second verses of the ninth chapter of Isaiah read thus :

" Nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun, and the land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict her way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations.

" The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light : they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined."

Compare this with Matthew iv. 12-16, " Now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee. And leaving Nazareth he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the sea coast in the borders of Zabulon and Nephtalim."

" That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, The land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephtalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles ; The people which sat in darkness saw great light : and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up."

2. The child thus born is the successor of David and to reign forever.

" Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." Isaiah ix. 7.

It is impossible to apply this passage to any other person than to Jesus Christ. For no other person was ever spoken of as the everlasting successor of David, except Jesus Christ. But your attention is invited to a passage which calls Jesus Christ " Our God."

It is said in Isaiah xl. 3.

" The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God."

This is applied to Christ in Matt. iii. 3 : " For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, the voice of one crying in the wilderness, ' Repare ye the way of the Lord, make his path straight.' Observe ; the prophet calls Christ ' Our God.' There can be but one exposition of this. The supreme God must be meant. ' Th is God is our God for ever and ever.' Psa. xlvi. 14.

In the following passage, the speaker declares himself to be God. And the speaker in this case was Christ as will be made to appear.

" Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth ; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear. Surely, shall one say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength : even to him shall men come ; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory." Isa. xl v. 22-25.

This text is, in fact, the language of Christ, and is, in part, spoken of Christ. The arguments in favor of this are :

1. The language upon its face concerns Christ. The same being who says "I am God and there is none else," is thus affirmed of in the declaration, " In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory."

The text relates to gospel times and gospel justification. Hear what Paul says.

" Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins : And by him, all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Acts. xiii. 38, 39.

2. This text is clearly applied to Christ by the Apostle.

" But why dost thou judge thy brother ? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother ? we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Rom. xiv. 10-12.

Here the Apostle solemnly admonishes us, that we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. To prove it he quotes the declaration of Isaiah, 45 : 23. " Every knee shall bow to me and every tongue confess to God."

This is followed by the Apostle, saying, " So then every one shall give an account of himself to God." Thus clearly affirming that " the Lord" spoken of by Isaiah is no other than " Christ," and that Christ is " God."

I now call your attention to the following passage.

" In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." John i. 1.

The only real ground of dispute in regard to this text is this ; is Jesus Christ the person here called the Word ? This point shall be made plain.

1. It was to this same Word that John gave testimony.

" In him was life ; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness ; and the darkness comprehended it not. There was a man sent from God whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light."

2. This same Word was made flesh ; that is became incarnate. " And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth. John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me : for he was before me."

3 Christ is named as the Word which was God. " And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

There you have it. The mystery, if any there was is all explained now. The Word is Jesus Christ ; and as the Word is God, it follows that that Jesus Christ is God..

I find that my time is out, and I rest the argument here so far as it relates to the title " God" as used in reference to Christ.

MR. MAY'S FIRST SPEECH.

I have never stood up in this community, nor anywhere else, and denied the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. I have not come here tonight, to deny them. I believe in them almost as much as I believe in my own existence. I have always preached of them to the churches that have listened to my instructions. I have christened my own children, and many of the children of my best earthly friends, in the name

of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. And most frequently do I dismiss the congregation of worshippers to which I minister, with that benediction, in which are invoked the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ—the love of God and the communion of the Holy Spirit.

In one sense, and that the most important sense, I believe in the unity, i. e. the perfect spiritual harmony of the three. I believe that the Father is the one living and true God, self-existent, eternal, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness. I believethat his spirit of power, wisdom and goodness were manifested in the Son, to whom his spirit was given not by measure—and I believe that it is the same spirit which is manifested in the Son, that worketh in us all to will and do, of God's good pleasure, and that it would bring us into harmony, unity, at-onement with the Father and the Son, in accordance with the prayer of Christ—John xvii, 20, 23.

You see then I declare, and those who have attended my ministry of the word here and elsewhere can testify that I have always, declared my belief that God was manifest in the flesh, i. e. that the character, the pure, holy, loving, self-sacrificing spirit of the man Jesus of Nazareth was a manifestation of God to men; and that God's Holy Spirit which was so fully manifested in Christ, is ever present, the spirit of truth, purity, mercy—pleading with the sinful heart, consoling the sorrowful, nerving and animating the soul to dare bravely, and endure patiently in the cause of truth and righteousness—the cause of God and humanity.

My religious belief will probably be more fully disclosed to you in the sequel of this discussion. It was necessary that I should say thus much, in order that our audience may understand aright the doctrine that is in question between myself and my friend.

I am not here to deny the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit *as they are set before us in the Bible*. I believe in them as Moses and the Prophets—Christ and his Apostles present them to my faith.

But I reject and I have come before you to maintain, on the authority of the Bible, my rejection of a doctrine called the Trinity, and set up in most Christian Churches as the great essential truth of the Gospel—a doctrine that I am confident is no where, in the old Testament or the New stated as it is stated in the creeds of the so called orthodox churches; and which I expect to prove is not supported by any de-

clarations in those sacred scriptures, properly understood.

I am here to deny and, if I am able, to maintain my denial of a doctrine which I am fully persuaded was not introduced into the Christian Church until after the 2d century and not established until the 5th century—more than four hundred years after the death of Christ; and then introduced by the Platonizing Fathers of the Church, who by their learning, eloquence and zeal, after a long continued struggle beguiled or overbore the unlearned Christians, who had been wont to rely wholly upon the teachings of Christ, his apostles, and their successors.

I have come here to deny a doctrine which I am confident the primitive Church, at least for the first three centuries did not believe or certainly did not accept as the standard of its orthodoxy, until after the 4th century—a doctrine which the early and most strenuous defenders of it, allowed was not taught by Christ, a doctrine which the Roman Catholic Church, its chief supporter, rests more upon the authority of traditionary lore, than of the words of the Bible; and which many theologians, chiefly of the English Episcopal Church, have acknowledged the insufficiency of the scripture evidence to prove.

It took at least four hundred years to establish this great corruption in the Christian Church. Soon after commenced the dark ages of a thousand years, during which the lamp of learning only flickered here and there in a cloister; the Scriptures were almost unknown to the people, and the dismal system of theology which had been devised in the great names of Athanasius and Augustine were substituted for the Gospel, and enforced by the authority of Church and State. Thus fixed and indurated in the mind of Christendom, the Trinity and its kindred doctrines have not easily yielded to the truth. The work of reform commenced 325 years ago under Luther—and it may take much longer to purify than it did to corrupt the faith of the Church, though great progress has been made within the last fifty years.

I have come not to deny but to maintain what the Bible teaches, *the unity of God*; to deny therefore and give my reasons from scripture for denying the truth of a doctrine, which seems (notwithstanding the disclaimer of its adherents) to require our belief in three Gods rather than one; which in the very statement of it implies that the second God of the Trinity

is greater than the first; and, when taken in connection with the system of doctrines that is built upon it, more than implies that the Son is more merciful than the Heavenly Father.

The doctrine which I deny, and have come here to oppose—the doctrine which I suppose to be essentially announced in the proposition which is the basis of this discussion—the doctrine of the Trinity is more fully and objectionably stated in the Creed of the Great Presbyterian Church—thus:

Confession of Faith Chapter ii. Sect. 3d.

In unity of the Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power and eternity: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father, the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son.

Chap. viii, section 2d, The Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did, when the fulness of time was come, take upon him man's nature; and all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance, so that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion; which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and man.

The same doctrine is stated somewhat differently in the articles of the great Episcopal Church of England and these United States.

In the creed of the church of which my brother Lee is a distinguished minister, the same doctrine, though somewhat modified, is thus declared:—

I. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.

There is but one living and true God, everlasting, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons of one substance, power and eternity;—the Father, the Son. [the Word] and the Holy Ghost.

II. Of the Son of God.

The only begotten Son of God was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men, and to reconcile us to God.

IV. Of the Holy Ghost.

The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

This is the doctrine, so stated, that I deem a monstrous and mischievous error. In speaking of it, I have always referred to the formula of the Presbyterian or Episcopal Church; and should have preferred in this discussion, to have had them for the propositions which I would undertake to refute. But as the 1st article of my brother Lee's own creed seems to contain the essence of the whole error, I have consented that that should be the thesis of our debate. I propose to show that this doctrine is not taught in the Bible.

In my arguments and illustrations I shall make use of and rely, mainly, upon our common English translation, availing myself no farther than may be absolutely necessary of the learning which has been brought to undermine this doctrine of the Trinity, by the theologians who are skilled in the Greek originals of the New Testament, and the Hebrew originals of the Old.

My friend, Mr. Lee, and myself, are perfectly agreed in believing that, "there is but one living and true God, everlasting, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things visible and invisible. But here we part; he affirms, and I deny, that the Bible teaches us that "in this unity of the Godhead there are three persons, of one substance, power and eternity."

This, all must allow, is a very marvelous doctrine. It seems self-contradictory, and therefore self-evidently false. Those who profess to believe it do not attempt to explain it. Neither do they agree in their manner of stating it. I have been told by a distinguished orthodox minister of this very city, that the creeds of the Presbyterian and the Episcopal Churches are stated in language which has become obsolete. "No Trinitarian," he said, "can be found who, if he were called upon to state his views, would state them in the exact language of either of those creeds." And yet, I am told all persons who are admitted to the communion of those churches, certainly those who are admitted to be ministers, are required to declare their belief of this doctrine of the Trinity, as it is propounded in those creeds.

All believers of it concur in pronouncing this doctrine a profound, a sublime mystery, too deep

to be fathomed, too high to be attained to by the human mind. A doctrine which the human reason could not have invented or discovered of itself, and cannot comprehend even after it is revealed. They declare it to be a doctrine which whether we understand it or not, we are bound to receive upon the authority of divine revelation—upon the teachings of the Bible.

Now, then, if this be so, I must demand that this doctrine, so important to be believed, yet so difficult of comprehension, shall be given to me precisely as I am to believe it, in the very words of Christ or his Apostles, or of some one or more of the revelators of the New or of the Old Testament. This, surely, is ■ most reasonable demand, for if unassisted, uninspired minds cannot comprehend this doctrine of the Trinity, they surely may not be trusted to devise the form of words, in which it should be stated and received. But will it be pretended that this doctrine, as we are required by the orthodox churches to believe it, is proffered to us in the language of Scripture. Surely not. My brother Lee will not claim that this doctrine—the 1st article of the creed of his own church—is offered to my acceptance in the words of the Bible: (I am told it was drawn up by himself)—much less will he claim, that this doctrine of the Presbyterian or the Episcopal churches is stated as it is found in any part of Scripture. No; even the words, Trinity, Triune God, are not anywhere to be found there; nor are there such phrases within the covers of this book, as God the Son, or, God the Holy Ghost. All such words and phrases are the devices of uninspired men—yes, of men who lived centuries after Christ.

The doctrine of the Trinity, so far ■ the Protestant Christians attempt to maintain it, is left to rest upon inferences drawn from certain expressions, words, or phrases found in the Bible respecting God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit. It is claimed by Trinitarians, that divine attributes are ascribed to each of these persons—nay, more, that the names of the Deity are given to each, and therefore, that they should be considered one and the same being.

Now the force of their argument will be not a little modified and weakened, when we consider the style of our Sacred Scriptures: the manner in which words referring to the Deity are used in them. The style of the Bible, you all know, is eminently figurative; but how figurative, how bold it is in the use of the names and attri-

butes of the Deity, you may not have duly considered. Not only angels, but good men, great men, very distinguished men, were called, in the ancient Scriptures, *sons of God*. Adam was said to be the son of God. Indeed, the Jewish people were called “the sons of the living God, (Hosea, i. 10.) We read that man was made in the image of God.

In the New Testament we read (John, i. 12,) “that ■ many as received Him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God.” Indeed, we are told (Rom. viii. 12, that, “as many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God.”

But more than this, those to whom the word of God came—the prophets, princes, judges—were called *Gods*. Moses was called a God to Pharaoh. (Exod. vii. 1.) And others of the prophets were called God, with additions to the name, which would to us seem applicable only to the High and Holy One. The High Priest, before Samuel, was called “Eli,” which meant “My God.” Eliab, meant “God my Father;” Elihu. “He is my God himself;” Elijah, “God the Lord;” Elisha, “God that saves. So, also, Ithiel (Neh. xi. 7,) meant “God with me,” and Lemuel meant “God with them,” just as much as Emanuel meant “God with us;” nay, it is a most pertinent fact; one that presses hard upon those who place much reliance upon such titles is ■ proof of the Deity of any man: it is, I say, a most pertinent fact, that those remarkable titles which, in Isa. vii. 14, ix. 6, are generally allowed to have been prophetically applied to Jesus of Nazareth, were primarily applied to a person who, in the 7th chapter, had been foretold ■ about to be born and to be called Immanuel; and in this 9th chapter was declared to have been born, and to whom the names El-gibbor, Abiad, Sar Shalom, were given; names meaning the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Now, whatever may be true of the prophetic application of these titles to Christ, it is equally true that, primarily, they were applied to some one in that day, probably Hezekiah, the son of Ahaz, who became ■ wise, mighty and peaceful prince; and this shows that the bestowment of even such high titles does not prove the man, to whom they were given, to be the Supreme God. It was a peculiarity of the Hebrew style.

To show how singularly figurative and bold the Hebrews were in the use of some of the titles of the Most High, I need only refer you to

Jeremiah, xxxiii. 16, where the prophet says—"In those days shall Judah be saved and Jerusalem dwell safely, and this is the name where-with she shall be called, (Yehovah Tsidkenu,) Jehovah our righteousness," (or, Jehovah is our salvation,) precisely the same title that, in the 23d chap., 6th verse, the same prophet is generally understood to have applied to Christ, and which is often quoted as an impregnable proof text of the absolute Deity of that beloved Son of God.

I am aware of the attempt which the very learned Dr. Adam Clarke makes to show a difference in the meaning of this same title in the one place and in the other. But he has failed to accomplish his object, though in his earnestness he has pronounced our common English translation of xxiii. 6, "ignorant and almost impious" epithets that we Unitarians should not be allowed so to apply to any part of this translation, without being accused of enmity to the Bible.

So too in Ezekiel xlviii. 35, Jerusalem is called, (Jehovah Shammah,) the Lord, or Jehovah is there, Exodus xvii. 15, Moses built an altar and called it "Jehovah God my banner." These examples may suffice, though many more could be adduced showing the exceedingly bold figurative style of the Hebrews.

Now I demand, if in a book, where the titles and attributes of God are so freely given to men and things, we do find some of these titles and attributes bestowed indirectly or directly upon Jesus Christ, whether we may thence conclude, that he was and really is the self-existent, and eternal Jehovah? This is the immense—the stupendous conclusion, which my brother, and other Trinitarians draw from so slight a premise.

I will go with him if he wishes, and our audience will have patience, into the details of this kind of proof, but I can forewarn him, he will find it too narrow, and too shallow to sustain the mighty system of faith that is reared upon it and upon arguments like it.

And then, Sir, if he shall succeed in making it appear that there is in the Scriptures of the Old Testament some evidence of the Deity of Christ—I shall insist that to sustain the doctrine of his Church he is bound to bring forward from the Old Testament or the New, evidence of the personality and Supreme deity of the Holy Spirit; for without that there can be no trinity; nor then without one further question being settled.

For even should he succeed in producing indu-

bitable evidence from the Scriptures of this part of his doctrine, he will then have the hardest part of his task *i.e.* to prove that there are three infinite persons, and yet only one—three eternals yet only one---three almighty Gods, and yet but one. At least, I think I shall be justified in the conclusion of our debate, in requiring him to produce me from the Old Testament or the New, a statement of this stupendous doctrine, in the very formula in which I am to receive it, given to mankind by Jesus Christ the author and *finisher* of our faith---or by one of his accredited apostles---or at least by some one or more of the Prophets, showing that this amazing doctrine was known before Christ's day, and precluded the necessity of his teaching it.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, if the doctrine of the trinity, in the unity of God, was known to Moses and the Prophets, and they meant to teach it in those passages, which are quoted from their writing, may I not ask with profound astonishment, at least may I not humbly inquire, why this doctrine was not more distinctly stated, so that the Jewish people might have had some idea of its truth, and not have fallen as they did universally into the belief of the simple, uncompounded unity of God. Nay was there not all the more need that the religious teachers of the Jews should have taught them this doctrine if it were true, seeing they had taken so much pains to declare and enforce the doctrine, that there is but one God, and to denounce the plurality of the deities worshipped by the Heathen? Was it not moreover, all important that they, especially Moses should have taught the true doctrine of the Trinity, so that the children of Abraham might not confound it with the trinity in the Godhead worshipped by the Egyptians, of which they must have learnt something during their long sojourn in that house of their bondage—or afterwards have confounded it with the Trinity, worshipped by some of the nations of Asia.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that it was against a similar, if not the same error which I oppose, that the great founder of the Jewish Theocracy was instructed to teach the simple unity of the godhead. That error, amongst the men of old time, sprang from their mistaking unwittingly perhaps, the manifestations of the divine attributes, for the being in whom they all are combined. The same error in the Christian Church has arisen I believe from the shame of the cross—the eagerness of his disciples to magnify the

person, the nature of Christ; and this error is maintained amongst us, as you will perceive in the arguments of my brother Lee, by an exaggeration of the meaning of epithets justly bestowed upon the dearly beloved son of God, who was, what all men were made to become—perfect in his sphere and measure as God is perfect in his. So far did the religious wisdom and holy spirit of Jesus, and the miraculous powers that were manifested in him—so far did they transcend what had been seen in other men—that those who believed in him and loved him could scarcely find words to express their conceptions of his exaltation—accustomed as they were to such lofty names and titles conferred upon far inferior prophets and teachers. But nothing is plainer in the narratives we have of his life, than that he disclaimed those expressions of regard, that were due to the Supreme Being alone, when offered by his friends; and that he repelled the accusation, brought by his enemies, that he made himself equal with God.

St. Paul from whose writings my brother Lee will quote some of the strongest proofs he can find in the New-Testament of the deity of Christ: St. Paul made some of the plainest and most emphatic declarations of an opposite doctrine—and there is one passage—1 Cor. viii. 4 5 6, which I think solves the whole problem between us Unitarians and the Trinitarians. The apostle there says, “there is none other God but one, for though there be that all called Gods whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be Gods many and Lords many) unto us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things and we in him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by him.” Here the Apostle recognizes the fact that other beings besides the one living and true God, may have been called by his names; but then he insists that the being whom we distinguish from all others, and whom even the Trinitarians distinguish as the 1st person of their Trinity, that he, the Father, is the one God. Now if Paul had said unto us there is but one God *Jehovah*, we might expect our trinitarian brethren to insist that in Jehovah there are three persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost; but the apostle says the Father only is God. Now, brother Lee, will not I trust, maintain that in the Father are three persons Father, Son and Holy Ghost, for that would be to maintain that one of the persons of the Trinity, contains the other two from which he is distinguished, moreover such an hypothesis would deprive the apostle's word of all mean-

ing. Until therefore, this remarkable declaration of St. Paul can be explained away, we must claim him as a Unitarian.

MR. LEE'S SECOND SPEECH.

My plan will be, first to reply to what may have been said, which I judge needs a reply. And then fill up the balance of my time with my direct argument. I shall pursue a direct line of argument, resuming it at each time precisely at the point where I shall have dropped it at the close of my preceding speech.

But little has been said, by my opponent, in reply to the arguments I have advanced. The reason of this is obvious. The speech read by Mr. May was written before he had heard my arguments, and of course it could not contain a reply to them.

He opened his address by telling you that he never denied the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. I never supposed that he did. A man who is at all acquainted with the Bible, and would deny their existence, would be a very strange affair. I have not accused him of denying the Father, Son, or Holy Ghost. The question is not whether there be a Father, or a Son, or a Holy Ghost. It is this: Who is the Son, or what is he? And, what is the Holy Ghost? Are they both God? And do they exist with the Father, in the unity of the Godhead?

But he has not told us, what he believes concerning the Son, and the Holy Ghost. He has used language, in the course of his remarks, that implied that he believes the Son is not God, and that the Holy Ghost is not God. But he does not say what he does believe respecting them. Now, will my opponent in this discussion be so kind as to tell us in what sense he believes Jesus Christ to be the Son of God. And what he understands the Holy Ghost to be. I trust he will explain this distinctly.

He has told us that the Doctrine of the Trinity was introduced into the church by the philosophers of the third century. And that, too, after an earnest opposition from the early friends of Christianity, who deemed it a corruption. I think him rather premature in introducing this aspect of the question at this early stage of the discussion. I shall hereafter urge the history of the early church on presenting my side of the argument. And when this feature of the discussion is on hand, he may have an opportunity for the use of all the guns he has got on this subject.

Mr. May informs us that a great many texts

have been given up by Trinitarians. But that is nothing to the purpose. The question is not what texts have been given up, or what retained by Trinitarians. The question is this simply: What does the Bible teach on the subject. Strong men on our side of the question may have given up the texts referred to, or they may not. But what of that? With that I have nothing to do whatever.

He says, some of the leading men of the Church of England have given up that Scripture is insufficient to sustain the doctrine of the Trinity, and rely, in part, upon tradition. Well, the Church of England may have given up, or it may hold many opinions that I have not agreed to, and shall not defend. But that is not the question. It is this: Is the doctrine of the Trinity taught in the Bible? To this point I shall direct my remarks, and to this point attempt to hold my friend, in this discussion.

He has introduced to notice and discussed the question of three Gods. But his play upon that is begging the question. For he does not know what my position is touching the points involved. He assumes, without proving it, that my views require a belief in three Gods. But this does not know and cannot prove. It is bringing up a remote point in the discussion at too early a period. I have not yet introduced but one point in the argument, and that relates only to the Deity of Jesus Christ. When I shall have reached that part of the argument that relates to the relation of the Father and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, he can grapple the question on which he now can say but little to purpose in the absence of any positions defined by me.

My opponent refers to the form of faith as found in the Presbyterian confession of faith, more objectionable than the statement of the doctrine of the Trinity in the Wesleyan articles of religion. He considers the latter as somewhat modified when compared with the former. But such is not the fact. The doctrine of the Trinity is as distinctly and as objectionably set forth in the one as in the other. The language is modified, but not the doctrine! He refers to a distinguished orthodox minister, in this city, who said that no Presbyterian would, if called to-day to express his view of the Trinity, do so in the precise language of the confession of faith. Now, abating the "distinguished," I suppose the reference is to myself. But it is not because their views now differ from the statement of the doctrine as found in the creed, but

that the forms of expression now used are different. Language has changed somewhat, but the doctrine remains the same. And I am just as willing to maintain the doctrine as the Presbyterians state it, as to maintain my own form of expression. I am willing to stand by that doctrine, as they state it, here and elsewhere. And my friend ought to know enough to distinguish between a doctrine and the statement of that doctrine. He must learn to distinguish between such things, or we shall get into great confusion of ideas.

Mr. May objects, that the doctrine of the Trinity is not stated in the exact words of the Bible. But that is nothing to do with the discussion. There are a great many doctrines that men believe, that are not stated in the exact words of the Bible. All we have to do now is to prove or disprove that the doctrine of the Trinity is taught by the words of the Bible. However the Bible may state questions, men misunderstand them, be they ever so plainly given. This discussion shows that my opponent in this argument, and myself, do not understand the Bible alike. It is for the purpose of ascertaining who agree on the meaning of the Bible that creeds are written. Now he and I understand the creed alike as to what is designed to teach, though we differ about the Bible. It is not, therefore, of any force as an objection to the doctrine of the Trinity, that our statement of it is not made in the very words of the Bible. The only point of importance is this: Does our statement of the doctrine truly express the idea of the Bible, or does it conflict with it. I affirm that it is in accordance with the Bible; and the task of my opponent is to show that it is not.

In the course of his remarks, Mr. May has not seen fit to notice the points I made on the application of the name of God to Jesus Christ. He has quoted and criticised texts that I have not introduced, while texts that I have introduced he passes by altogether.

He remarks in one part of his speech that the language is figurative, highly so and not to be relied on. Indeed he affirms therefore that it does not prove Christ to be God, however plainly he is so called by the Scriptures. It would not be difficult by this mode of argumentation to prove God out of the Bible altogether.

Mr. May says that it was common for good men to be called "Sons of God." Adam he says was the Son of God. The Jewish people

too were the "Son's of the Living God." Now this remark that the language of the Bible is "figurative" and therefore unreliable if adhered to, will compel him to the conclusion that Jesus is a mere man, and in no sense distinguished from any other of the Son's of God. Jesus Christ is in no wise above the rest. On this ground he is not in an extra sense at all the Son of God. Again do I call upon my opponent in this argument to define himself clearly as to the sense in which he regards Jesus Christ to be the Son of God.

The attempt to dispose of the prophecy of Isaiah vii. 14; ix. 6, is certainly insufficient to meet the points I made. He denies that it is a prophecy of Christ. He affirms that it is a prophecy of somebody else. But of what or to whom it relates he does not affirm nor argue. It "probably" means Hezekiah, he says. But beyond this feeble conjecture nothing is attempted.

He has told us that Jerusalem is called "The Lord (Jehovah) our righteousness," and thence argued that Jehovah being applied to Christ does not prove him Divine. I have not yet quoted such a text. It is not therefore in the discussion. When he has replied to, or even noticed all my former texts it will be time enough to add new ones to the list.

He asks why not state the doctrine explicitly in the language of scripture. Now although he fails to see it plainly stated there, I do see it. And I think I shall prove it is plainly stated therein. We disagree, but I hope to succeed in establishing my positions in opposition to his.

His text from Paul, which speaks of "none other God but one," I have on my notes and it shall be considered hereafter.

Now he has said that the name of God is applied to creatures and therefore not a proof that Christ is truly God. It is admitted that such accommodated uses are made of the name "God." But the connection in every such case explains that it is used in a qualified sense. But there are passages in which the name "God" is applied to Christ without any qualification, and in such an emphatic manner as to demonstrate that he is in an absolute and unqualified sense the true God. For instance in Rom. ix. 5, it is said of Christ, "Who is over all, God blessed forever." If over all surely he is God. Will my opponent tell us in the face of this text, that Christ is only one of "God's many?"

Compare this expressive and unqualified language respecting Jesus Christ, with the careful-

ly guarded expression in the following text, where the name of God is applied to men "I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the Most High: But ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes." Ps. lxxii. 6, 7.

These who are called "God's" shall die like men and fall like one of the princes. But Jesus Christ is God over all, blessed for ever. Amen. You see here the distinction. It is plain and forcible. I ask now will that text do as clear proof that Christ is truly God.

"Whose *are* the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ *came*, who is over all, God blessed for ever." Amen. Rom. ix. 5.

This text is conclusive.

If any thing can be more emphatic on this point it is found in the following passage:

"And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, *even* in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." John v. 20.

I now ask your particular attention to the following argument drawn from the book of Revelations.

"And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write; for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is a thirst, of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son." Rom. xxi. 5 7 8.

Now who is it that gives the water of life freely? I maintain that it relates to Jesus Christ. The person in this text, is he who gives the water of life freely. But Christ gives the water of life. See Christ standing in the temple and crying, while they poured the water round the altar. "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." John vii. 27. Again it is said Rev. vii. 17. "The Lamb that sitteth in the midst of the throne shall feed them and lead them to the fountain of living water."

That Christ is the subject of this text will appear further by comparing it with others of which there can be no doubt.

It is the "Alpha and Omega."

Christ is the Alpha and Omega;

"And behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega,

beginning and the end, the first and the last." Rom. xxii. 12 13.

Here Alpha and Omega is the person who was to come quickly with his reward, to give to every man as his work should be.

But it was Jesus Christ that was to come quickly.

"I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify these things." Verse 16.

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book." Verse 18.

"He which testifieth these things saith surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so come Lord Jesus." Verse 20.

The argument stands thus:—Christ is he that was to come quickly. He that was to come quickly was the Alpha and Omega.

The Alpha and Omega is the person speaking and spoken of in the first text.

"And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write; for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst, of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son." Rom. xxi. 5, 6, 7.

I will now go back to Chapter 1.

"Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Rev. i. 7, 8.

This is entirely conclusive, if it can be shown to be the words of Christ.

It has been shown in the preceding argument, that Christ is the Alpha and Omega.

The context here confirms this position, as follows.

"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day and, heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, what thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea. And I turned to see the voice that spake with me. And being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks; And in the midst of the seven

candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; And his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters. And he had in his right hand seven stars; and out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword: and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength. And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and death." Rev. i. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.

This is Christ without a doubt. "I am he that liveth, and was dead." Verse 18.

He is "the Alpha, and the Omega." Verse 11.

"The first and the last." Ib. It is repeated, verse 17.

It has now been made clear that Christ is the person, who declares himself to be the "Alpha and Omega," the first and the last. The full force of the name God, therefore is applied to Christ, in Chapter xxi. 6, 7.

MR. MAY'S SECOND SPEECH.

Mr. Chairman. In the course of the remarks of my brother Lee in his last speech he gave a reason for the making of creeds. I will first look at that reason. It was this. Creeds express more distinctly than the Bible does the truths of religion which it is necessary to believe. Now, Sir, this is to assume that the makers of creeds are better teachers of religion than Jesus Christ and his Apostles were. And if this be true, then does it put creeds in the place of those truths which our blessed Saviour declared were the foundation of his church. The which if a man have and doeth them Jesus said, "I will liken him unto a wise man who built his house upon a rock. And the rain descended and the floods came and the winds blew and beat upon that house and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock." But is it possible for human skill to be thus superior to the divine revelation, the words of which are able to make us wise unto salvation? I think not. Now if it were necessary to have the fundamental truths of religion expressed in the language of the Presbyterian confession of faith or of the Articles of the English church, why has not the

author and finisher of our faith himself so stated them? I pause for a reply,

It is my honest conviction often times repeated that Jesus Christ is the best teacher of his own religion. And his words are amply sufficient. They are just suited to the wants of the world. For the wisest purpose they are so left full of instruction as to be adapted to the highest capacity and tax to the utmost the greatest intellect, while it affords the simplest mind abundant nourishment. "Herein" says one of the same scriptures "are shallows where a lamb may sip and greater depths where an elephant may quaff."

But I ask can a child, accept the statement of these labored propositions of religious faith and comprehend them? No sir. And it is because I would save the young and the enquiring after truth from becoming entangled with this yoke of bondage that I protest against ministers assuming to gather up these speculative statements and incomprehensible propositions, and demanding our consent or professed belief of the same, or refuse to allow any man claim to be a Christian. The office of the minister is not to dictate forms of belief, but to entreat, to persuade, aye, even to compel men to come to the feet of Jesus and learn of him. Not to learn what he may have taught brother Lee or myself Sir, or any one else, but to "learn" what Christ may teach himself.

Now to assume that he will not teach others, but they must take their faith from our words, is to make a fearful assumption. We Unitarians sir are not so presuming. We only presume to teach those who come to us what is the faith of Jesus, as it was taught by Jesus, in the words of Jesus himself and his apostles.

My brother says he wishes me to say explicitly in what sense I believed Jesus Christ to be the Son of God. I will do it sir. Whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God. To Jesus Christ was given the Spirit not by measure, and therefore he is the *dearly beloved* Son of God. And if we receive him as our instructor, guide and pattern, he will give us power to become the Sons of God. Are not we called the Sons of God and even joint heirs with Jesus Christ—yes sir, even joint heirs with Jesus? Let not my brother charge me with attempting to bring Christ down to us. It is not so. We may be aspiring; but our ambition is to be more and more like Christ. And in the diligent use of the means of grace to be-

come nearer allied to Christ. That is my great heresy.

My brother says that I in my expositions of scripture will make him a mere creature, and in no way above Paul. Well he himself calls Christ the "first born of every creature." And he is doubtless created by God, just as much as you and I are creatures of God.

With these few remarks I shall now give attention to some of the texts he has quoted. The first to be noticed are Isaiah vii. 14—ix. 6.

In these passages the prophet does not say that the child shall be Immanuel, "God with us" or that he shall be the wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the Everlasting Father—but that he shall be called by these names—names certainly not any more significant of deity than many names that were given to several of the distinguished Priests, Prophets, Judges, princes of Israel—one of whom was called "My God"—another "My God Jehovah"—another "My God himself"—not to mention many others of like kinds. The bestowment of these titles upon Jesus, therefore, at most only puts him into the category of those whom St. Paul alludes to 1 Cor. viii. 6, "the many in Heaven and on earth who are called Gods," but still are not the one living and true God.

I am willing therefore to let the passages stand as they do, and weigh all that they can in favor of Bro. Lee's proposition. For the most he can possibly prove by them is that Jesus like Eli, Elijah, Elihu, and many other priests and prophets, was *called* God.

I will only add that if these divine titles were prophetically applied to Jesus Christ, they were primarily applied to some person who was about to be born when the first passage was uttered by Isaiah, and had been born when he uttered the second passage. That the person referred to in both cases was Hezekiah is the opinion of several distinguished orthodox commentators—as well as several Unitarian ones—and still more is it the opinion of that remarkable man and very learned theologian Ram Mohan Roy—the Hindu Rajah who examined the question without any of the prepossessions of a Christian sectary. But the exposition of this would take up much time—that can be better spent—for it matters very little whether it were Hezekiah, or some other person, to whom these mighty names were primarily given.

The following is from Prof. Stuart's Commentaries on the Hebrews, as quoted by John Wilson in his "Concessions of Trinitarians"—pub

lished 1842. Manchester, England, at Riding's Court, St. Mary's Gate.

"The birth of a child to be called Emmanuel, who was to spring from a virgin, is predicted; which birth was to be a proof to Ahaz, that, within some three years (comp. v. 14 with 15) the land of Judah should be delivered from the confederated kings of Israel, and Syria, who had invaded it. Originally and literally, this seems applicable only to the birth of a child within that period of three years; for how could the birth of Jesus, which happened seven hundred and forty-two years afterward, be a sign to Ahaz, that within three years his kingdom was to be freed from his enemies? Such a child it would seem, was born at that period, for in chap. viii. 8, 10, he is twice referred to, as if then present or at least then living." [This prophecy in its "primary and lower sense" is similarly explained by Calmet and H. Horne: in his introduction to the study of the Scriptures.—Ed. of Concessions.

Grotius says—"Will be given—Hezekiah who was very unlike his father Ahaz. This passage is acknowledged, not only by Christians, but by the Chaldean interpreter, to relate in the same manner but in a more excellent sense to the Messiah."

Samuel White, Fellow of Trinity college, about one hundred years ago, wrote a commentary on Isaiah. He says on this point:

"That is, he (king Hezekiah) shall reign in the throne of David" as the metaphor signifies, and as the prophet more fully explains himself in the following verse, which cannot be literally true of our Saviour, whose kingdom was not of this world, as David's was; but in a second and sublime sense, the expression denotes that form which God devolved on his Son, of governing his spiritual kingdom, the Church."—*Ib.*

Mr. May then introduced to notice the passage in John i. 11-4, saying:—

Probably there is no other passage, in the whole New Testament about the meaning of which so much has been written. Neither Trinitarian nor Unitarian commentators themselves are agreed as to the signification of Logos here translated "the word"—nor of the phrase —translated "the beginning." I do not expect that I can remove all obscurity from this passage—but I do expect to show that it gives little or no support to the doctrine of the supreme deity of Jesus Christ—much less will it help my brother Lee to prove the proposition he is contending for—that there are three equal

persons in the Godhead—for there is not^t an allusion here to the Third Person, the Holy Ghost.

If he was *with* God—then he *was* God only in a sense compatible with the relation implied by the preposition *with*.

It is fair, nay it is imperative upon us, to interpret every part of an author's book as far as possible in accordance with the known purpose, and intention for which he wrote it.

At the close of the 20th Chapter of his Gospel; in which John had been giving an account of Christ's first interviews with his disciples after his resurrection, the Apostle says—"these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God." And no one of the gospel narratives contains so many declarations that Christ is the Son of God, not God himself and it is from the pen of this very apostle that we have the record of Christ's most distinct denial of divine attributes. Nay, in this very 1st chapter 18th verse, we have a statement which should go far to explain the meaning of the writer in the foregoing verses—he says in the 18th verse, "No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." In accordance with the doctrine here, and in so many other parts of his gospel declared. I think we may and ought to expound these introductory sentences now under consideration.

In the Epistle of John there are many things earnestly written against certain erroneous doctrines then prevailing respecting the person of Christ. Ireneaus, who lived in the early part of the 2d century, who was a pupil of Polycarp—Irenæus tells us in his work against Heresy, that John wrote his gospel for the express purpose of refuting the false and absurd notions, which were beginning to spread in the churches of Asia Minor respecting the nature of it.

"Now, the Gnostics maintained that the Supreme God dwelt in the remote heavens, surrounded by chosen spirits, Aeons, as they called them, and gave himself very little concern with what took place upon earth; that the world was created by an inferior and an imperfect being, who was also the author of the Jewish dispensation—that Christ, one of the Aeons, was sent by the Supreme God to deliver men from the tyranny of this Creator, and from the yoke of his law; that there were also various created spirits or Aeons, maintaining different offices, independently, for the most part, of the Supreme Deity, the names of some of which Aeons were Life, Light, and particularly the Logos, which

represented the Divine Reason, or Wisdom; that the Aeon Light became incarnate in John the Baptist. All these spiritual existences were represented as distinct from each other and from the Supreme God."

Is it not very plain that this introduction to John's gospel was well adapted, as we are told by Ireneans it was intended to correct these errors. Let us now look at the passage in the light which history throws upon the purpose for which it was written.

No one has denied, and many orthodox Commentators have allowed that a correct interpretation of the word "Logos," would be the Reason or the Wisdom of God, although Dr. Adam Clarke thinks it would have been better if Logos had not been translated at all, but left to stand, *Logos*, as in the original.

In the beginning, cannot, as Prof. Stuart and many other orthodox Commentators allow, be understood to mean from all eternity, because eternity had no beginning. Whether the Evangelist here referred to the beginning of all time, or to the beginning of the gospel dispensation, is not very clear. Judging from the frequent use this same Apostle has made of this phrase in other parts of his writings (ch. xv. 27, xvi. 4; 1 John, i. 1, ii. 7; 2 John, v. 6; also Luke, i. 2,) many incline to the supposition that he meant the beginning of the gospel, and commenced his history of the new or spiritual creation in a manner similar to Moses' account of the first—the material creation. Whichever may have been in his thought, he declares that "*In the beginning was the Reason or the Wisdom of God*," as was declared in Proverbs viii., that this Wisdom was with God, that it was God and not an Aeon, a distinct being from God; that it was God, just as much as God was Love, which the same Apostle declares in his 1st Epistle, iv. chap., 8th verse.

The attributes of Wisdom, Love and Power, are so essential to the nature and character of the Supreme Jehovah, that either of them may be put for him, just as we, in our day, may say of a great orator—he is eloquence itself; or of an excellent woman—she is goodness itself. All things were made by this Wisdom of God, and not by an inferior being, one of the Aeons, as the Gnostics taught. "*In him*," referring to Wisdom as a person, or as God himself, "*was life, and the life was the light of men*;" thus, you perceive, absorbing into the one God the wisdom, the life and the light which the Gnostics distributed among several Aeons, or divine

persons. He then speaks of John the Baptist, and declares that he was not the light, but that he was sent to bear witness of the light; thus denying the doctrine of the Gnostics, that an Aeon which they called Light was incarnated in John. In the 12th and 13th verses he announces the same great truth declared by Paul in Rom. viii. 14, that as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God; and then, in the 14th verse, declares, that the same wisdom that had been with God from the beginning, was signally manifested in the person of Jesus Christ, who was full of grace and truth, and in whom, John tells us, that he and his fellow disciples, (we) beheld the glory (not of God himself,) but the glory of the only begotten Son of the Father. Thus bringing the commencement of his narrative into harmony with the close of it, and setting Jesus before his readers as the Christ the Son of God.

I cannot expect that you, sir, or my brother Lee, or any who have been accustomed from childhood to read this introduction to John's gospel as an explicit statement of the Deity of Christ, will at once, or very readily accept the exposition I have now given of this very obscure passage, about which theologians—Trinitarian as well as Unitarian—have differed so much; but it seems to me to be authorized by the intimations we have of the design of St. John in writing his gospel, and to be incumbered with fewer and lesser difficulties than the common orthodox exposition.

At any rate, it certainly cannot be fairly claimed that the deity of Christ is here announced, unless modern readers know better what it means than the writer himself, for he declares that he beheld in the Word made flesh only the glory of the dearly beloved Son of God.

Heb. i. 8, also was quoted by brother Lee. Now I ask you to look at this passage. It speaks of "thy fellows," in relation to Christ. This certainly expresses the idea of inferiority to the Supreme Being. It is further said—"Thou has loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."

Now, unless my brother succeeds wholly in his arguments, it cannot be allowed that the Supreme Being has any fellow, or equal companion. If the being spoken to herein be a God, he is one who has a God who is called "thy God," as you see. There is no need of any Commentator nor authority to gloss over these

words, or explain them. The writer plainly indicates the inferiority of character. This passage is to be referred to that class of passages in which the name, God, is used in an accommodated sense, and applied to one who is so called, because he acted under Divine appointment as a messenger for the carrying out the great and gracious purposes of God.

My brother quoted the passage that declares we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. There is no incompatibility herein with my views. I believe with all my heart, in the unity and harmony of the Son with the Father, in the great work of judgment. The Son is the great agent to dispense judgment and to sit in judgment with God. Next only to the Father does he stand in the universe.

And in closing these remarks, I ask you, Mr. Chairman and hearers, I entreat you to read, examine, and judge for yourselves. You should not allow the prejudices of education, nor the dictates of the minister, to sway your mind. Be your own student of religious truths, and act independent of all dictation. Go to Jesus. Learn of him. He is the best teacher of his religion. And be assured that there is no doctrine nor truth, of saving importance, that he has omitted to state plainly in his written word. And whatever you learn by your own study of the Scriptures will be of incomparably more value to you, than what you may receive at the dictation of others.

SECOND EVENING—MARCH 1.

MR. LEE'S FIRST SPEECH.

In resuming the discussion I propose to reply to some things that were offered in the last speech of my friend. My friendly opponent has failed to meet my previous arguments, and many of them he has not examined at all. And certainly if a public disputant examines some of the arguments of an opponent—passing over others entirely, it is fair to conclude that he feels unable to meet the case, unless it was for want of time. But in this case it was not for want of time because foreign matter and new matter were introduced.

And there were some things introduced by my opponent of a character altogether at variance with the subject under discussion, a complete digression from the line of argument. The creed question was one thing. Why this was introduced I am hardly able to tell. It was all wide of the remark and had nothing to do with the question. It was not only wide of the

mark, but it was a misrepresentation of the views of those who believe in creeds. It was such, first by representing that creeds were a substitute for the Scriptures. Now nothing is more unfounded than this statement. In my own creed there is one article that expressly specifies as essential that we believe in the sufficiency of the Scriptures. It reads thus:

"The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scriptures, we do understand these canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority there is no doubt in the Church."

And this article must have been known to my friend. Now so far from creeds being a substitute for the Scripture, they require a belief in the Scriptures. No man can be admitted to membership in a church having a creed without believing in the inspiration of the Scriptures. Those churches that have no creed, peradventure might receive those who do not believe it.

Second. We are represented by our creed as claiming to make better theology than Jesus Christ. Nothing is further from the fact.

It is not to make better theology, or different theology from Christ's, that creeds are formed. It is to affirm what, in our opinion, Christ's theology is.

Either my friend or I embrace fundamental error. In view of this fact of difference among men on what is fundamental, there is necessity for writing down distinctly what they deem fundamental truth. Hence the origin of creeds. He would not join my church with the creed it agrees to as fundamental. Whether I could join his church, that has no creed, I do not know and probably never shall.

But there are other reasons for the use of written creeds.

Some persons put a false construction upon the Scriptures.

Some have no faith to write.

Some have a faith they do not like to write down. They wish more sea room to manage their theological ship. They will not be confined to any specified doctrines on fundamental principles.

Indeed, they have no system at all, of positive truths. Their system is an entire system of negations from bottom to top, and from side to side. They deny this, and they deny that: but affirm no distinctive truths.

3. It represented creeds as the mere dictation of the ministry.

Now this is an entire mistake. For the construction of various ecclesiastical bodies is such as to prevent the ministry from dictating if they would. And any such remarks or insinuations are uncalled for, and very much out of place and out of taste.

The laymen help make the creed with nine-tenths of all Protestant denominations. There was an appeal to the people not to be dictated to by the ministry, and it was affirmed that it is not their business to tell the people what to believe.

And besides, my friend is the last man to make such an appeal against ministerial dictation. Of all the pastors in this city, he alone has been engaged for weeks past in dictating what it is proper to believe on the question of the Trinity. He has met with the public assemblies here for free discussion Sabbath afternoons and taken active part therin. He has advertised through the papers, and called the people to come and hear from him what it was right to believe. And his sermons are the creed of his framing. I repeat it. Of all the ministers having a pastoral charge, Mr. May has done more on this subject, probably, than any one in Syracuse.

II. Another matter which has nothing to do with the argument is, his appeal for sympathy on the ground of being regarded as a heretic.

I have not called him a heretic. I have only treated him as a gentleman and a brother. I brought my views and laid them down at his feet to be discussed as unsettled questions. As a denomination, I stand as much alone in this city as he does.

There is but one church of each denomination, but I have the smallest church, the less influential church, the poorest church, and preach my views for less than half the salary for which he preaches his.

Why should he thus appeal to the sympathy of the audience? Instead of treating him as a heretic, I have held in abeyance my cherished sentiments for years. These I have laid at his feet, and together we have been, thus far, taking them up as unsettled questions. In this discussion such an appeal was out of place. I have not appealed for sympathy, even when, as in years gone by, my own mother's children treated me as a heretic for entertaining sentiments I held dear. This I was and am willing to endure; satisfied to stand ■ the rock washed

by the surging billows, only anxious to know that I am sustained by God's eternal truth.

Having passed over the extraneous matter that it was deemed proper to introduce to your attention, I will now notice what was said which in some sense relates to the argument.

John i. 1. His exposition of this text is entirely fanciful, and however well satisfied the audience may have been with the exposition he gave, it was very evident that he was not himself satisfied with it. But I will examine his exposition.

1. He makes the Word to mean Wisdom, of the divine attributes.

This is absurd upon its face, as will appear by reading the entire passage, with his rendering incorporated into the text.

(1.) In the beginning was the attribute of God, Wisdom, and the attribute of God, Wisdom, was with God, and the attribute of God, Wisdom, was God. Or, read it thus, changing the form of speech, "In the beginning was the Wisdom of God, and the Wisdom of God with God, and the Wisdom of God was God."

This is worse sense than he put into my mouth when he talks of God being with himself. With my view of the Triune nature of God this is explained by personal distinction in the God-head.

But his difficulty admits of no explanation, as there is no personal distinction between God and his attributes.

(2.) This makes an attribute to have become flesh. Verse 14: "And the attribute of God, Wisdom, was made flesh."

"We beheld his glory." That is, the glory of God's attribute, Wisdom! And this, too, is said to be as of the only begotten, full of grace and truth! An attribute full of grace and truth?

(3.) Christ developed no more of the attribute, Wisdom, than he did of the attributes of power and goodness.

(4.) Wisdom is not the sense of the original "Logos." The word usually translated Wisdom, is *Sophia*.

"Logos," rendered "Word," signifies a word, speech, language, &c., but is not rendered Wisdom.

2. Mr. May comments upon the word "beginning." He says it is not eternity, for that had no beginning. I answer to this, beginning does not express eternity, but implies it. All back of the beginning must be eternity. Now, it is clearly stated, that then the word *was*. "Was"

—and of course could not have been created. “Was with God” in the unity of the Godhead. It is then said, “was God.” Lest the expression, “was with God,” should be understood to imply a distinct being: something less than God—something not God—these words were added, “And the Word was God;” or, literally rendered, “God was the Word.” It is all in harmony with the doctrine of the Trinity but with nothing else.

3. He supposes it to have been written as a refutation of the Gnostics—a sect of heretics.

(1.) The weight of proof is against it.

It was written too early.

From A. D. 68 to 97, have been the range of dates by the best critics.

The Gnostics did not, according to the best authority, attract attention until after the commencement of the second century.

(2.) If it be so written, it proves nothing to his purpose. It is inspiration and tells the truth.

Mr. May has replied, on the application of the name of God to Christ, that it is applied to men.

To this I reply—The name of God is not applied to men, without qualification, as it is to Christ.

In every case in which the Hebrew word Eli, or Eloah, or Elohim, is applied to men, it is always connected with some qualification, or remark, or circumstance, which renders it impossible to mistake or suppose the true God is meant.

The cases which Mr. May has cited, not only fail to meet my argument, but absolutely confound his own.

He has cited six cases, as follows:

“Eli, Eliab, Elihu, Elijah, Ethiel, Lemuel.”

In all these cases he has misrepresented the sense of the Hebrew.

The true sense is as follows. Five out of the six are derivatives from the Hebrew, El, God, and like many more such cases, were given to men as descriptive of their character, or their faith, as follows:

Eliab, means, “to whom God is Father,” not, “God my Father,” as Mr. May says.

Elihu, “Whose God is He?” that is Jehovah Not God himself.

Elijah, or Eliaas, “My Lord is Jehovah,” not “God the Lord.”

Ithiel, “God with me.”

Lemuel, “Of God,” that is, “created.”

Eli. This, as a proper name, is not a deriva-

tive from El; nor, as a proper name, does it mean “My God.” It is not spelt as the derivations are. It means “Ascent,” and was applied to Eli as High Priest.

The Saviour’s exclamation, Matt. xxvii. 46, “Eli;” Mark xv. 34, “Eloï.” Quoted from xxii. 1, Psalms. The Hebrew is a different word from the name of Eli, the High Priest.

As authority, I refer to Gesenius and Roy, Hebrew and English Lexicographers.

MR. MAY’S FIRST SPEECH.

I am sorry that my brother Lee has brought into this discussion such things as have fallen from him this evening, in reply to my remarks on a former occasion. But it may be incidental to such discussions. I, however, assure you that I did not suppose I had appealed to your sympathies. I had no such intention. Surely I was unconscious of having any grievances to complain of. If I did tax your feelings by my appeals to your sympathy, I am sorry for it and beg your pardon. But I know that however you may have felt, my own heart did not ache under the load. I am sorry that all this should follow a remark—a mere pleasantry that dropped from me incidentally—and that was, after presenting my views in the language of Scripture, “and yet I am called a heretic!”

Now, I beg to assure my friends that so far from needing any special sympathy, I am very happy in my present relations. It is true I should feel more so if my brethren the ministers agreed with me more fully—if they thought more as I do. I trust I am honest in my views. And all that I do ask is that you grant that I am honest.

But I repeat it. I really hope you will pardon me for any, even the slightest pain I have unintentionally inflicted by my appeals to your sympathy. At any rate, I will take it all back, and thus relieve you of any tax you may have felt imposed upon you.

My brother Lee says, he stands as much alone as I do. Now I want to know of him if he is in all respects treated by the clergy of this city and the church, as I am treated? Do they regard him in the same relation to themselves as they do me? The answer to that question will give precisely my meaning in the remark I made. I repeat it. I do stand alone here. I expected to, when I came here years ago. If I had not made up my mind to before, I should

not have come. And yet I am not alone in the cause of God. My Heavenly Father is with me, and I believe that the truth of God is with me. But I am sorry for these personal allusions. I am sure that I do not desire them. It is far better to have none of these flings at each other in our discussion.

You will remember what I said about creeds. My brother Lee represents me as having introduced it as an extraneous and out of the way topic. This, however, is a mistake. I had made the declaration, that if his statement that creeds were more easily understood than the Bible, then I demanded that the doctrine of the creed be stated in the very words of the Bible. I insisted, as the right of every Christian, that the words expressive of his faith be offered to him for acceptance in the very words of the author and finisher of our faith. And I insisted, that no man, nor any set of men, should be allowed to draw up in their words a form of faith in religious matters, for me to accept. Now, you will remember with what might he defended creeds as better than the Bible.

I asked him to furnish me even one text that explicitly contained the doctrine of the Trinity. But he did not furnish it. And I insisted, and I do insist, that I do not regard, nor ought any Christian to regard the words or teaching of any men who have ever lived, as we should the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ, in this matter. If, therefore, Jesus Christ has left us without a creed, then it is clear to my mind that it is better to be so, and that no creeds ought to be formed by men to finish up the Saviour's work! He has authorized no one to do any such work.

My brother Lee said, that although we differ about the Bible, he and I agreed on the creed, as to what it meant. But this is not correct. I consider his creed teaches that there are three Gods. But he does not so understand it. Is there any agreement, then, between us? And are we to receive it as any evidence of the superior excellence of creeds.

Indeed they are most difficult of apprehension, and many serious disturbances among the theologians have arisen from misunderstanding about their meaning. And another more serious objection to them is, that they entangle the unskillful and unlearned, when, under strong re-

ligious emotions, they enter the churches. Often have I seen young converts, of only a few months old in the church, arrayed in the most imposing and solemn manner and enquired of as to their belief in a dozen or more articles, any one of which would require months of investigation fully to comprehend.

I hope you will remember that my appeal was not an appeal against the ministers, but in favor of your studying for yourselves the truths you would believe. And I repeat it. I intended no appeal against the ministry. But I do say, that so long as they presume to come, with their expositions of divine truth, between the minds and hearts of men, and God and his Christ, so long do they interpose a cloud of human mysticism before the radiance of ineffable light. Ministers should not dictate in matters of religion. The Author and Finisher of our faith, he alone should be our authorized teacher, and our faith should be based only on what he shall teach. And I promise you that, so far as my ministrations are concerned, whenever I shall perceive that any one has so learned of Christ as to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world, I will not doubt that he has become wise unto salvation, and not trouble myself or him with enquiries into his speculative opinions upon these matters of doubtful disputation.

What I did say, however, will be fully reported, and I hope you will read it for yourselves, in justice to me, in justice to the ministry, and in justice to this discussion.

My brother Lee attempted to refute my exposition of John i. 1-14. Now it is useless to go over that exposition again. If, however, he denies that the word Logos properly means Wisdom, he assumes what some of the ablest defenders of the orthodox faith have not dared to assume. But I cannot go over again, at this time, all I then said. It will also be published, and I hope you will read it carefully. To travel over that ground again would prevent progress in our discussion.

My friend has attempted to disprove the correctness of the translations I gave you of the Hebrew names of God, as applied to man. They were not my translations, however, but those of orthodox Trinitarian writers. I did

not expect that they would be denied by him.

He has also said, that when the name of God is given to men, it is always qualified so as to forbid the idea of divinity being expressed in reference to any creature. And he said, too, that whenever it was applied to Christ it was unqualified and absolute in its application. And yet, last night, I quoted to you from Heb. i. 9, a passage in which the connection plainly indicates that it was in a subordinate sense.

Now, you remember with what tremendous emphasis my brother Lee quoted the words in the eighth verse, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever;" and yet read the comment of the Apostle in the ninth verse, "Therefore God, even thy God, has anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Now could language be plainer to qualify and limit the application of the name God to Jesus Christ, showing his inferiority.

But to return to the exposition of John, i. 1. My brother Lee denied that the word Logos is ever translated Wisdom. Now, I want to ask him if he means to say that Logos is not translated Wisdom? (Mr. Lee answered, "It is not, by any Greek Lexicographer that I have consulted.")

Mr. May here introduced various quotations from criticisms on the word Logos.

Mr. May then said—I now return to make an appeal that I have a right to make. It is this. For proof of the truth or falsity of the doctrine of the Trinity, I appeal mainly to the teachings of the New Testament. And I do not think it is perfectly kind in my brother Lee to complain that I have not noticed all the texts that he has quoted, and infer therefrom that I am unable to meet the case. There has not been time yet. But if it be necessary, I assure you that I will reply to every one of them, if he thinks fit. He said, in reference to texts I brought forward, and not very graciously, I thought, that he would notice them when he pleased. He wishes to pursue his course, and so do I mine. I promise him, however, to avoid nothing that may be adduced as evidence or argument in favor of what I regard a system of tremendous error, and which is the basis of a system that substitutes something else for Christianity, and hinders the progress of the gospel more than all things else. And as I am

set for the defence of the truth, I am under the necessity of opposing this system of error, in my own pulpit and elsewhere, until convinced that I am mistaken, or satisfied of the unreasonableness of my course.

I now say, and at the hazard of repeating some things before stated, no person who has not been trained up in the belief of the Trinity would detect any evidence of it in the Old Testament. The strict unity of God was the fundamental doctrine of the religion promulgated by Moses and taught by the prophets. No idea of a Trinity, in that unity, seems to have found its way into the Hebrew mind. If the doctrine be true, it was not revealed by any of the prophets of the old dispensation.

If it be the corner stone of the Christian system of doctrines, it was left for the founder of that system, or some of those who were ordained by him the preachers of his gospel, to announce and define this marvellous peculiarity in the unity of the Godhead. It was all the more necessary that they should be explicit on this point, because such a doctrine would be so new and unexpected to the Jews, and so hard to be believed.

If this doctrine were self-evidently true, or highly probable—if it accorded readily with the doctrines already revealed—slight intimations of it, occasional allusions to it, might have been sufficient to have ensured its prompt reception, as of the doctrine of immortality. But, standing as this doctrine does opposed to, inconsistent with the great leading essential truth of revealed religion—the unity of God—we might reasonably expect to have it distinctly stated, and earnestly enforced by the founders of the New Faith. For as I said before, if this doctrine be beyond the invention of the human intellect and incomprehensible by it even after it has been revealed, surely we may not safely trust an uninspired mind to devise the form of words, in which the great mystery must be presented to men—and accepted by them in order to salvation.

Now, therefore, I call upon my opponent here to point me to a single passage in the whole New Testament, where this doctrine of the Trinity is explicitly stated, a single passage in which it is stated as explicitly as it is in this article of the creed of his own church—which

is the thesis of our discussion. I ask for one single passage from the lips of Jesus Christ or any one, the greatest or the least of his apostles, in which it is declared that in the Godhead there are three persons of one substance, power and eternity? Look at the doctrine, and tell me whether—if it be a true one, it does not involve such violent improbabilities, that it ought to have been carefully stated, and solemnly enforced upon us by an authority as high at least as one of the accredited apostles of Christ, if not indeed, by the great Master himself—the author and finisher of our faith? Look at the doctrine we are discussing—not only does it seem to teach that there are three Gods in the one God, and to declare that each is equal to either of the other two—but it involves, as we learn from the development of it in the 1st and 4th articles of the creed, the further most incomprehensible of all propositions, ever offered to the acceptance of the human understanding, namely, that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son, and yet that the Holy Ghost conceived the Son, that is, became the mother of the person from it proceeded; that is to say, if there be any meaning in the words intelligible to my mind, that the Holy Ghost emanated, proceeded, came out from her own offspring. But I cannot show this doctrine to be more unreasonable, more incomprehensible than it is acknowledged to be by many of its stoutest advocates. From a mass of acknowledgements that I have before ■ to this effect, I have room only for a couple. Bishop Beverage in his Private Thoughts on Religion, says, "I ever did, and ever shall, look upon those apprehensions of God to be the truest, whereby we apprehend him to be the most incomprehensible, and that to be the most true of God which seems most impossible to us,"—and after going on to show that this is the character of the doctrine of the Trinity, he breaks out "O heart-amazing, thought devouring, unconceivable mystery! Who can believe it to be true of the glorious Deity?"

The famous Dr. South says, "that any one should be both Father and Son to the same person [to David.] that he should produce himself; be cause and effect, too; and so the copy give being to its original. seems at first ■ very strange and unaccountable, that, were it not to

be adored as ■ mystery, it would be exploded ■ a contradiction." Sermons vol. iii. p. 240.

Now I ask my brother, and every other Trinitarian, where Christ or either of his Apostles ever set up this mystery to be adored—I require him to show me where in one instance the author and *finisher* of our faith or either of his apostles, has intimated that we are to accept as true a statement so inconceivable as this, in the proposition before us, viz., that "in unity of this Godhead there are three persons of one subs.ance, power and eternity."

Mr. Chairman, I am not alone, in feeling as I do, the right and the necessity of pressing this demand for some explicit statement of this most mysterious, incomprehensible, and self-contradictory doctrine, made by an authority higher than that of any church on earth. Hear Sir, the words of a man, whose praise has been in all the churches; whose Psalms and Hymns have been used for the last hundred years more than those of any other author; and whose piety and biblical learning have never been doubted. I allude to Dr. Isaac Watts. For many years he had lived in the belief and written in the defence of the doctrine of the Trinity, which had been instilled into him in his youth. But light broke into his mind upon this subject. He commenced anew the study of the Scriptures with reference to it; and after long, diligent prayerful examination, became satisfied that such ■ doctrine was not to be found there. Hear an extract from his solemn address to the Deity and you will see that he only asked for the same that I have.

"Hadst thou informed me, gracious Father, in any place of thy word, that this divine doctrine is not to be understood by men, and yet they were required to believe, I would have subdued all my curiosity to faith, and submitted my wandering and doubtful imaginations, as far as it was possible, to the holy and wise determinations of thy word. But I cannot find thou hast any where forbid me to understand it or to make these enquiries. My conscience is the best natural light thou hast put within me, and since thou hast given me the scriptures, my own conscience bids me search the scriptures, to find out truth and eternal life: It bids me try all things, and hold fast all that is good. And thy own word by the same expressions, encourages this holy practice. I have, therefore, been long searching into this divine doctrine, that I may pay thee due honor

with understanding. Surely I ought to know the God whom I worship, whether he be one pure and simple being, or whether thou art a threefold deity, consisting of the Father, the Son, and the holy Spirit.

"Dear and blessed God, hadst thou been pleased, in any one plain scripture, to have informed me which of the different opinions about the holy Trinity, among the contending parties of christians, had been true, thou knowest with how much zeal, satisfaction, and joy my unbiassed heart would have opened itself to receive and embrace the discovery. Hadst thou told [redacted] plainly in any single text, that the Father Son, and holy Spirit, are three real distinct persons in thy divine nature. I had never suffered myself to be bewildered in so many doubts nor embarrassed with so many strong fears of assenting to the mere inventions of men, instead of divine doctrine; but I should have humbly and immediately accepted thy words, so far as it was possible for me to understand them, as the only rule of my faith. Or hadst thou been pleased so to express and include this proposition in the several scattered parts of thy book, from whence my reason and conscience might with ease find out, and certainty infer this doctrine, I should have joyfully employed all my reasoning powers, with their utmost skill and activity, to have found out this inference, and ingrafted it into my soul."

Now my brother (said Mr. May turning to Mr. Lee) I am precisely in the position of Dr. Watts. I wish only to be told plainly "in any single text that the Father the Son, and holy Spirit, are three distinct persons" in one divine nature. Do this and I will bow submissively to its authority, and try to bring my understanding to comprehend it, however mysterious may appear to be the doctrine that it teaches. But I cannot submit to the binding force of the statements of a human creed, nor any arrangement of mere human opinions as a test of faith and Christian character. These are what are objectionable, because they demand assent [redacted] penalty of a denial of Christian character, and refusal of admission to the communion of the Church. This is the evil of creeds and not merely that they express belief of truths specified. It is the use made of them, Sir. But I must trespass no further.

MR. LEE'S SECOND SPEECH.

This creed idea it is apparent is destined to occupy undue attention, which I regret as it is really foreign to the discussion. My opponent denied that the creed was expressed in the language of the Bible and very earnestly repu-

dicates their claim to his respect or faith. Now no man writes creeds for any such purpose as he represents. No one asks or demands of him or any one else compliance with the creed they may believe. I write creeds for myself and for those who agree with me. And so of all other. And that is all they are for—to express their opinion of what the Bible teaches. Now will he write down his own views of what he considers gospel truth?

Mr. May says he understands my creed to teach that there are three Gods. But that is a sophism, It does not give the point. It is this. Does he understand me to believe that there are three Gods. Now our dispute about the Bible is not what somebody believes it to mean, but what the author means, whose writings we quote. We disagree about the meaning of the authors of the texts quoted from the Bible. But we do not disagree about what the author of the creed means that is quoted. And I again repeat that on the creed we are agreed, while on the Bible we disagree, as to the meaning of the author.

Mr. May next refers to my quotation of Heb. i. 8, and complained that I did not notice the 9th verse that he supposes qualifies the application of the name God to Christ. Now I did not designedly omit to notice the passage he refers to. But passed it by for want of time. There is not so much force in the quotation as he would give to it. He said you will remember, that I denied that there were any cases in which the name "God" was applied to Christ, with qualification or limitation. But this is a mistake. What I said was—that when the name God is applied to any creature, there is always something in the connection which so limits it, that it is impossible to suppose that the Son of God is meant. But that the word God is applied to Christ not only without limitation, but in such connection as necessarily to lead us to believe that the Supreme God is intended. I shall hereafter examine that portion of the passage to which your attention was invited by Mr. May. It appropriately comes in to a subsequent part of my argument.

I now turn to his remarks on the word Logos. I admit that "Reason" is one of the significations given to Logos. But this does not bring him within the scope of his own argument, for

Reason is never used as a theological term to express an attribute of God.

He thinks me unkind in pressing him to reply. Now I will not be considered unkind, and therefore I take it all back and say he may reply or not as he thinks best. I admit that he is under no obligation to reply to me unless he is disposed so to do.

He complains that I did not notice some texts that he has quoted, and commented upon. To this I reply that I had supposed it was his duty to examine the pertinency of texts quoted by me on the affirmative of this question. And his reply to those quotations it would be my duty to examine. But according to the established rules of discussion certainly it cannot be my duty to examine his criticism of texts supposed by him to be on my side of the question, but which I have never quoted. And it is impossible for him to know that I would introduce them. So that such a course on his part may do nothing in forwarding the discussion, but be all lost time. But I will waive all that.

My opponent has offered to accept as authoritative one single text which distinctly and explicitly sets forth the doctrine of the Trinity. This may seem very fair and generous but no text could be framed out of human language which would be explicit in his estimation. Amid all the conflicting views of Christendom you cannot find an individual who professes to believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures, who will not say the same thing. There is no doctrine of the gospel but is disbelieved by somebody unless it is the simple existence of God. Yet all these rejectors of all these doctrines will every one say—show me an explicit text, and I will believe.

But I will show you that this doctrine is more explicitly stated than any other doctrine. There is no one doctrine unless it be as before stated—the simple existence of God upon which the Christian world are so generally agreed. If then there are less dissentients from this doctrine, than from any other one doctrine, it is strong presumptive evidence that it is more explicitly stated than any other one doctrine. And I expect before the conclusion of my arguments to make this appear clear

and full. But there must be time for all this. As he has said so say I, you must not hurry. But I do expect to do one of two things certainly, and they are—I shall succeed or fail!

My opponent brings up the creed again in the matter of the origin and birth of the Son of God, and attempts to make out an absurdity on the assumption that the Divinity was begotten by itself. This is however grounded on a misapprehension of our views touching the birth of Christ. Now that which was conceived by the Holy Ghost was the humanity that is all. But Mr. May speaks as though we regarded Christ as all divine,—body, bones, flesh and all. But this is not so. Just as truly as we believe he was Divine so do we believe that he was human also. And that which we believe of his humanity alone, can not be the legitimate ground of an assumption of absurdity as if applied to his divinity. We do not so affirm of his Divinity, and therefore the absurdity cannot be properly charged upon our sentiments.

He has laid a great deal of emphasis upon the "mystery" of the doctrine of the Trinity. That there is mystery about it I frankly admit. But there is as much mystery in the unity of God as there is in his Trinity. God is all mystery. One who knew more than both of us said, "Who by searching can find out God." There is mystery in our own existence. The union of body and soul, mind and matter is a mystery. I am a mystery to myself. And if Mr. May is not to himself it is because he knows a great deal less than I do or a great deal more.

Mr. May has introduced to our attention an extended notice of Dr. Watts. But what of that? It proves nothing, nor is it to the point in this argument. All it amounts to is this: Dr. Watts was a Trinitarian in his early days. In after years, when far advanced in life, he embraced some of the views that distinguish Unitarians. There may be some others who have so changed their views. A great many have turned the other way, and from being Unitarian in sentiment have become Trinitarian. Now, I could quote their declarations on my side of the question. But the point is not how many, or who, have changed their views, nor what they may believe. But it is this. What

does the Bible teach on the doctrine of the Trinity?

Dr. Watts was doubtless a splendid poet, but he was never distinguished as a great theologian. Poets are rather poor theologians, generally. And if my friend and myself had more poetry in our heads we should doubtless have less theology.

I turn now to his quotation from Heb. i. 9, which speaks of "thy fellows" as applied to Christ. There is no contradiction between this and our theory as Trinitarians, when considered as a whole. He can make it appear contradictory with our sentiments, as he gets them up for us, by leaving out our faith in Christ's humanity. But we believe in two natures, human and divine, as possessed by Christ. And there are passages of Scripture which relate to him in one or the other of these natures which are spoken of separately, and some in which both are recognized. And this discrimination is necessary to the correct understanding of the Scriptures. This is the key of the harmony of divine truths, and without it they cannot be explained. Some of the passages refer to Christ's human nature, while others refer to his pre-existent nature. Now, on this point I will remind my friend, Mr. May, that he omitted, on the last evening, to say whether he believed in the pre-existence of Christ or not.

I have remarked before, that it was my design to prove, first: that the Lord Jesus Christ was God; second: that the Holy Ghost was God; third: and then prove their unity and equality with the Father in the Godhead. In view of this announcement of my purpose so to arrange the argument, Mr. May gains nothing by his remark that I have not yet proved the Holy Ghost to be God. That is to be proved as a separate matter. I am laboring at one point at a time. The single point that has thus far occupied my attention, is the Divinity of Christ, which I am to prove first from the application of the names of God. I am now to show you that the name Jehovah is applied to Christ.

The name, Jehovah, or Lord, is also applied to Christ as I will now prove.

In the Old Testament, where the word Jehovah, or Jehovah, occurs in the Hebrew, our translators have usually rendered it Lord, and

have printed it in capitals to distinguish it from another word, Adonai, which is also translated Lord.

The common reader may know, then, that where the word Lord is found printed in small capital letters, Jehovah is the word used in the original. This word Jehovah is only applicable to the eternal God. It signifies the self-existent; he who gives existence to others; he who was, is, and shall be. I will prove that this ineffable name, Jehovah, is applied to our Lord Jesus Christ.

In the New Testament the Greek word, Lord, is Kurios, by which the Hebrew Jehovah is usually rendered in Greek.

This word signifies a Lord, possessor, owner, master. It is often applied to men, but is also applied to the Supreme Being.

"Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God."—Matt. iv. 10.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God."—Matt. xxii. 39, Mark, xii. 30.

"They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless."—Luke, i. 6.

"The temple of the Lord."—Luke, i. 9.

"The angel of the Lord."—Luke, ii. 9.

"They brought him to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord."—Luke, ii. 22.

"The spirit of the Lord is upon me."—Luke, iv. 18.

These cases are sufficient to show that the word Lord, is used in the New Testament to describe the true God.

A few texts will settle this question.

The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool."—Psal. cx. 1.

The original here is, "Jehovah said unto my Ladona."

David here calls Christ my Lord.

"While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, what think ye of Christ, whose son is he? They say unto him, the son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord? saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?"—Matt. xxii. 41-45.

Christ was David's Lord.

MR. MAY'S SECOND SPEECH.

Mr. May rose and commenced his reply by saying, "I will begin where my brother has left off—and I will begin with a simple question. That question relates to the text quoted respecting the name Jehovah. It is simply this. How can one Jehovah sit at the right hand of another Jehovah, and yet there not be two Jehovah's? And yet he tells us he believes that there is but one Jehovah. Now I dont know what contradiction is, if that is not contradiction in plain terms. And I charge him with using a form of words in his statement, of the doctrine of God's nature, which involves the tremendous untruth of three Gods instead of one."

My brother has said many things which I omit to notice; but I invite your attention to the following passage, he quoted on the last evening. "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true, and we are in him that is true, *even* in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." 1 John v. 20.

The word "even" you will find in italics. It is not in the original. You should therefore read the passage "and we are in him that is true, in his Son Jesus Christ." The great John Calvin, who will not be suspected of favoring my side of this question, says of this passage, "the apostle intends to express the means of our union with God, as if he had said that we are in God by Christ." Erasmus, the older contemporary of Luther and Calvin; the great scholar of the Reformation; Arch. Tillotson, a great name in the English Church; Dr. Adam Clark, and others, interpret this in the same way. Dr. Bloomfield even more plainly, "we are in union with the true God by means of his Son Jesus Christ."

"Grammatically considered the words "this is the true God," may refer either to Christ or to "him that is true." I refer it to God the Father, who is the chief subject of discourse. In this construction I have the authority of Erasmus, Grotius, Rossmuller, and others, three of the greatest Biblical critics. The language of Grotius is as follows :

"This is the true God; namely, he and none else whom Jesus hath declared to be the object of worship. The pronoun (*outos*) "this" not unfrequently relates to a remote antecedent; (as in Acts vii. 9; x. 6.) "And eternal life;" this is said

by metomysing. The apostle means that God is the primary and chief author of eternal life. So also Christ is called life, (John xi. 25; xiv. 6,) because next to God the Father he is the cause of eternal life."

If this does not satisfy my brother Lee that this text is not certainly in his favor, but rather in mine, I will agree with him to leave it, until we have settled the question between us on other grounds. Then if he establishes his position, I will give up this to his side of the argument, but if he fails, I shall hold to it as helping to support mine,

(Mr. Lee said agreed), Very well, then, said Mr. May, it is understood, and he is welcome to all the benefit of that concession. He then resumed, saying,

My brother Lee quoted Rom. ix. 5 : "Whose are the father's, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever."

The whole argument of my opponent depends upon the punctuation. He knows I trust, and will not deny, that the original manuscripts of the New Testament are without punctuation. The sentences even are not divided from each other by any marks. The translators therefore are left to punctuate as they think the sense requires. Now in this case, if we adopt the punctuation proposed by Griesbach, or that by Rosenmuller, both of them Trinitarians, and very eminent in Biblical learning, the sense is materially changed. Let the period be placed after the word all, and it then reads, "of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all. God be blessed for ever." Which words are added as a doxology in the midst of a paragraph.

The following is from Wilson's Concessions of Unitarians—quotations from Erasmus abridged by Mr. Wilson.

"This passage may be pointed and rendered in three different ways. First; of whom, according to the flesh, is Christ, who is over all. God be blessed for ever. Second; of whom, according to the flesh, is Christ, who being God over all, is blessed for ever. And third, which is perfectly suitable to the purport of the discourse "of whom is Christ according to the flesh :" finishing the sentence here and subjoining what follows "God, who is over all, be blessed forev-

er," as an ascription of praise for our having secured the law, the covenant, and the prophecies, and lastly Christ sent in human nature : privileges which God, by his unspeakable counsels had bestowed for the redemption of mankind. And here if the word God be understood to mean the whole sacred Trinity, (as is frequently done in Scripture where for example we are commanded to worship God and serve him only) then will Christ not be excluded ; but if it be explained to denote the person of the father, (which is a common signification of the term God, as used by St. Paul when Christ or the Spirit is mentioned in conjunction) then, though clear as noon day that, in other places Christ as well as the Father and the Holy Ghost are called truly God, this passage will not be valid to confute the Arians ; there is nothing whatever to prevent its application to the Father. Those therefore who contend that in this text Christ is clearly termed God, either, have little confidence in other passages of Scripture, or pay scarcely any attention to the style of the apostle. A similar passage occurs in 2 Cor. xi. 31. "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who is blessed forever ;" the latter clause being undeniably restricted to the Father. If however, the church teaches that Rom. ix. 5. must be interpreted of the Deity of the Son, the church must be obeyed, though this is not sufficient to convince heretics, or those who listen only to the words of Sacred Writ ; but if she were to say that that passage cannot be therein explained in conformity with the Greek she would assert what is confuted by the thing itself."

If my brother Lee should satisfy me that this text should be punctuated as it is in our common translation, I should contend that Christ is God over all only by appointment, only for a season, until as Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 28, tells us he will give up the kingdom to the father. For a season, the Father hath committed all judgment to the Son, John v. 22. ; has given all things into his hands, Matt. xxviii. 18. In this sense Christ is as he is called in Acts x. 36. "Lord of all." God has given him a name above every name. "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord

to the glory of God the Father." Phil. ii. 10.

I will next notice the following passages :

Isaiah xl. 3—Matthew iii. 3.—The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a high way for our God.

Matthew iii. 3. This is he that was spoken of by the prophet Ezias saying, the voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

The passage in Isaiah is obviously a glowing description of the return of the Israelites from their captivity in Babylon. Bishop Lowth, the most distinguished of all the commentators upon Isaiah, thinks those interpreters are mistaken who can see in this famous chapter only a prophecy of the coming of Christ. He maintains that the primary reference of the prophet was to the return of the Jews from their long bondage in that strange land. In this the Bishop is followed by Dr. Adam Clarke, who has quoted pages from the Bishop's commentary into his own notes. Dr. Lowth says, "The evangelical sense of the prophecy is so apparent and stands forth in so strong a light that some interpreters cannot see that it has any other ; and will not allow the prophecy to have any relation at all to the return from the captivity of Babylon. It may be useful therefore to examine more attentively the train of the prophet's ideas, and to consider carefully the images under which he displays his subject. He (the prophet) hear a crier giving orders by solemn proclamation to prepare the way of the Lord in the wilderness ; to remove all obstructions before Jehovah marching through the desert—through the wild, uninhabited, impassable country. The deliverance of God's people from the Babylonish captivity is considered by him as parallel to the former deliverance of them from the Egyptian bondage. God was then represented as their king leading them in person through the vast deserts, which lay in their way to the promised land of Canaan. It is not merely for Jehovah himself that in both cases the way was to be prepared, and all obstructions to be removed ; but for Jehovah marching in person at the head of his people."

Thus Bishop Lowth and Dr. Adam Clarke acknowledge, what is indeed obvious to common sense, that the prophet had in his mind primarily the return of his countrymen from their

bondage in Babylon. But the reference which is made to it in Matt. iii. 3, is supposed by my brother Lee and by Trinitarians generally to show that in a higher, a spiritual sense, it was a prophecy of John the Baptist's appearance as the forerunner of Christ, who is here called "our God."

But if in its secondary, spiritual sense this title was given to Jesus Christ, to whom was it given in its primary sense? Who was the leader of the Hebrews out of their captivity in Babylon? Did Jehovah appear in person and conduct them over the high way that was to be prepared? No one, I trust, believes that he did. Certainly my friend though my opponent in this discussion, will not assume that it was to Jehovah himself, in person, that the prophet alluded. It must have been then to him who as the minister, the servant of God, conducted the people of Israel back to their beloved land: unless my friend prefers to suppose the prophet meant to personify the spiritual presence of God, that would animate and encourage the people on their way.

For the prophet to have referred to the leader of his people out of Babylonish captivity, by the title of "our God," would not have been so bold a use of language as was made by Moses in reference to himself, (Deut. xxix. 5, 6): "I have led you forty years in the wilderness, your clothes are not waxed old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxed old upon thy foot. Ye have not eaten bread, neither have ye drunk wine or strong drink, that ye might know that I am the Lord your God."

We none of us misunderstand Moses in this case. He thought of himself as the agent, the instrument of God in affecting the deliverance of his people from Egypt. In Exo. vii. 1, "The Lord said unto Moses, see I have made thee a God to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet." Thus appointed at the commencement of his great undertaking, he might with great propriety, and in the same sense, say of himself at its close, when so many wonders had been wrought at his hand, "I am the Lord."

Isaiah in describing that great national deliverance, second only in importance to the one of which Moses was the leader, and familiar as he was with the ascription of divine titles to those who were appointed to do great things as the

agents of the Most High, might very naturally have spoken of the leader of this new deliverance as "God" in the subordinate sense. If this be so, the application of the language of this prophecy to Jesus Christ, surely cannot help my friend in the least to prove that he was "our God" excepting in the same subordinate sense.

Here I have done so far as this passage is concerned with my argument against the doctrine of the Trinity. But as all the importance it has been supposed to have in the proof of that doctrine, is derived from the fact that it is quoted in Matt. as if it were a prophecy of the appearance of John the Baptist.—I may as well here call the attention of my brother Lee to the manner in which quotations are made from the Old Testament by the writers of the New Testament, that he may not hereafter place too much confidence in them.

It will be very evident, I think, to a careful reader of the New Testament, that the Evangelists and Apostles quoted from the Scriptures of the Old Testament very much in the same way that other writers of their day and nation were wont to do; that is to say, applying passages from any part of those venerated Scriptures, which might seem to them at all pertinent to the event they were narrating—or the doctrine or sentiment they were endeavoring to illustrate or enforce. And they often introduced such quotations by one or another of these phrases—"as it was written," "as it was spoken," "thus said," "that it might be fulfilled," when really the passage quoted had originally no reference to the matter about which they of the New Testament were writing.

The Hon. Edward Everett, in his younger and better days, when he was a minister of religion, wrote an admirable book entitled "A Defence of Christianity," in refutation of a disingenuous attack that had been made upon it by Mr. George B. English. In that book he devotes a chapter to this very matter of quotations—that having been one ground on which the attack was made. He says in that chapter, "I have collected the following among a multitude more examples, which prove that the Rabbis applied passages of Scripture, historical, prophetic and preceptive, to events to which they could not have supposed them to have had any original reference; and that there is no dif-

ference between the forms with which they introduce mere illustrations and prophecies actually fulfilled."

That the Jewish writers should have made such frequent quotations, on all occasions, from their Sacred Scriptures is not surprising, seeing that they comprised the greater part of the literature that was generally disseminated amongst the people. They were read in all their Synagogues every Sabbath day, and it was a part of the education of their youth to commit to memory large portions of certain of these sacred books.

The only thing to which I wish to direct your attention is that they introduced their quotations by such phrases as these—"as it is said"—"as it is written"—"to fulfil that which is said"—implying that the event narrated, or the doctrine delivered had been indicated aforetime by some one of the sacred writers—though in fact the passage quoted had no prophetic reference to the matter they then had in hand. But this was the style of quoting &c. common among the Jews both before and after the New Testament was written. It is not strange therefore, that the writers of the New Testament should have used the same as we find they did. Let me give you a few examples.

Extracts from Mr. Everett's Defence, &c.

"A man shall not go out on the Sabbath day with a sword, or a bow, or a shield, a sling, or a spear. If he do so, he is guilty of sin. Rabbi Eliezer said, they are ornaments to him. But the Doctors say, they are not ornaments, but a disgrace, *for it is said*, Isaiah xi. 4, they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks, and shall learn war no more."

"Rabbi Eliezer said, he who does not eat on the night of the first day of the feast, must do it on the night of the last day. But the doctors decide, that there is no compensation. *Of this it is said*, (Eccl. i. 15) that which is crooked cannot be made straight, nor that which is wanting be numbered."

"When Rabbi A bun entered before the king of the Romans, the king turned towards him. Some followed after to kill the Rabbi; but they saw two sparks of fire streaming from his neck, and let him go, *to fulfil that which is said*,

(Deut. xxviii, 10) and the nations shall see that thou art called by the name of the Lord, and fear thee..

"Of the future days, it is thus written in the Zohar upon Deuteronomy, 'The Lord shall return thy captivity.' What does this signify? The Lord shall bring back Israel from captivity, and then the righteous shall return, and be joined to his place, *and then shall be confirmed* what is written Psalms cxl. 13: Surely the righteous shall give thanks to thy name, the upright shall dwell in thy presence."

Finally. Rabbi Hoschaia says: "Jerusalem shall be a torch to the Gentiles, and they shall come to its light." How is this proved? Because the Scripture saith, And the Gentiles shall walk in thy light, and in the Lord's house shall be established. *And this is that which was said by the Holy Ghost, by the hand of David, the king of Israel*, for with thee is the fountain of life, and in thy light we shall see light." Ps. xxxvi. 9.

"It is the custom of the Mishna and its supplements, to adduce the written Scripture [as authority,] though what is treated of be not a matter of written Scripture, but of oral tradition; still the Scripture is applied to it."

Now, it seems very obvious, that quotations are often made by the writers of the New Testament from the Old in the same way, merely on the principle of accommodation, when the passage quoted had no prophetic reference whatever to the event spoken of, or the doctrine inculcated by the evangelist or apostle. Two or three examples will suffice. After speaking of Joseph and Mary going with the infant Jesus into Egypt, Mathew says chapter ii. 15: "And he was there until the death of Herod, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, out of Egypt have I called my son." This form of expression would seem to indicate very plainly the fulfillment of prophecy. But turn to Hosea xi. 1, from which this quotation is made, and you will find "when Israel was a child, I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." Words spoken of the people Israel, and referred to what had been done seven hundred years before.

In the same chapter, we find another instance where the slaughter of the infants in Bethlehem is spoken of; (18th verse) "In Rama was

there a voice heard, lamentation and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted because they would not." In the place referred to, the prophet is alluding to the mourning in Rama, when the Israelites were carried through into captivity.

In Acts, Peter speaking of the fate of Judas, describes it as something which must needs be accomplished, "For it is written let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein, and his bishoprick, let another take." Words found in the Psalms, spoken of the enemies of David, without the slightest reference to Judas.

Again, in John xiv. 36 : Where it is related that the soldiers refrained from breaking the legs of Jesus, because he was dead already, the Apostle says, "For these things were done that the Scriptures should be fulfilled, a bone of him shall not be broken." Words that he took from Exodus xii. 46 : "neither shall ye break a bone thereof," that is of the paschal lamb.

Sometimes not only the words, but the meaning of the sentence quoted is changed in order to adapt it to the purpose of the writer, and yet the words "that it might be fulfilled" are retained. As for example, in Mathew xxvii. 9, 10. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value, and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me." Now, the allusion here is to a passage in Zachariah, (not Jeremiah) ; between which however and the case in hand there is no relation, or similarity whatever except the mention of "thirty pieces of silver" and the word "potter."

These examples must suffice. I have made these remarks not because I disbelieve that there are no prophecies in the Old Testament, of events fulfilled in the New, for I believe there were; but that I may put my brother Lee on his guard, by reminding him that every thing which seems at first sight to be introduced in the New Testament as a fulfilment, will be found on examination not to be so.

THIRD EVENING—MARCH 2.

MR. LEE'S FIRST SPEECH.

I shall occupy but little time in my rejoinder

to Mr. May's remarks of the last evening, where in he attempts a reply to my arguments. To my quotation of the passage which says, "The Lord said unto my Lord." He says "how can one Lord say to another Lord, sit thou on my right hand, unless there are two Lords?" The answer is, just as easy as God could say, "Let us make man," when there is but one God. Both cases are explained by a reference to the personal distinction in the Godhead. The first Lord is the Father, the second Lord is the Word or Son.

The next point he noticed was 1 John i. 5.

We have agreed to let this passage rest for the present, he having admitted that its grammatical construction is such as may be made to mean either. The next quotation criticised is Rom. ix. 5 : "Whose are the Father's, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen."

On this text Mr. May said,

"The whole argument of my opponent depends upon the punctuation. He knows, I trust, and will not deny, that the original manuscripts of the New Testament are without punctuation. The sentences even are not divided from each other by any marks. The translators therefore are left to punctuate as they think the sense requires."

"This passage may be pointed and rendered in three different ways. First, of whom, according to the flesh, is Christ, who is over all. God be blessed forever. Second, of whom, according to the flesh, is Christ, who being God over all, is blessed for ever. And third, which is perfectly suitable to the purport of the discourse "of whom is Christ according to the flesh :" finishing the sentence here and subjoining what follows, "God, who is over all, be blessed forever," as an ascription of praise for our having secured the law, the covenant, and the prophecies, and lastly Christ sent in human nature ; privileges which God, by his unspeakable counsels had bestowed for the redemption of mankind."

On this text Prof. Stewart has an entire vindication of the present rendering of this text in his 3d letter to Channing.

It is enough to say that to make it read as Mr. May would have it, he has to add a word which is not in the text, "be"—"God be blessed," And this is in fact an interpolation of the

text, which is not allowable by any correct laws of criticism.

He quoted these words, "I have made you a God unto Pharaoh," to prove that this name does not prove Divinity. But it is added, "Thou shalt speak all that I command thee." Again :

"The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." Isa. xl. 3.

On this he quoted from Lowth and Clarke in proof of my misapplying it. Now it is very remarkable that so much reliance is put upon the constructions which men give to these passages, rather than upon the direct and explicit application made of those passages by the sacred writers themselves.

In reference to Bishop Lowth I cannot determine the correctness of the quotation, as it is not at my command. But I have consulted Clarke in his comment on Matt. iii. 3. He says "This is quoted from Isa. xl. 3, which clearly proves that John the Baptist was the person of whom the prophet spoke." Thus it is evident that Clarke is positively against Mr. May's view of the text.

But Mr. May vindicates his construction of the text by affirming that the New Testament writers were exceedingly loose in their quotations from the Old Testament. To illustrate this Rev. Mr. Everett was quoted as the quoter of the Rabbies. It is only necessary to say in reply, that the manner in which the Rabbies, who are uninspired and full of errors, quote, is no proof how those who were inspired quoted. But here the declaration is absolute. "This is he that was spoken of by the prophet." Matt. iii. 3. Did he tell the truth, or did he not? If he did, I have the argument. If he did not, all confidence is destroyed in the inspiration of the New Testament. My friend can take which horn of the dilemma he pleases.

I am not a little surprised that my friend persists in his demand for more explicit declarations. Surely I have furnished the most specific texts. But he assumes to re-punctuate, and even to add to the original where he deems it necessary to destroy the force of my quotations from the Scriptures. And this is done on the strength of human authorities. Now I have not relied on these, but have quoted the Word of God. I

could quote authorities—a thousand to his one. For the common sentiment of Christendom is with me. If I could quote one text more explicit than any yet given, he would doubtless try to explain it away. For this is a peculiarity of this school of critics. In illustration of this I will quote the declaration of one of his own denomination, Rev. Theodore Parker. He says on this point,

"If the Athanasian Creed, and the thirty-nine articles of the English Church, and the Pope's bull, Unigenitus, could be found in a Greek manuscript, and be proved to be the work of an inspired apostle, no doubt Unitarianism would, in good faith, explain all three, and deny that they taught the doctrine of the Trinity, or the fall of man." Discourse on Religion, p. 357.

At this point I will close my rejoinder, and now introduce to notice the vision of Isaiah.

"In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory. Then said I, Wo is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts. Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then I said, Here am I; send me. And he said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed." Isa. vi. 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10.

Now let us turn to the following text:

"But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him: That the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them."

These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory | not believed? and how shall they believe in him and spake of him." John xii. 37-41.

Isaiah says he saw the King, the Jehovah of hosts. John says he saw Christ's glory, and spake of him. Therefore Christ was the Jehovah of the prophet.

Again it is said in Isa. xl. 3 : "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God."

Matt. iii. 3 : "For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, and make his paths straight."

This text was before quoted to prove that Christ is called God. It is now quoted to prove that he is called Jehovah.

Isaiah viii. 13-15 : Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence, to both the houses of Israel; for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them shall stumble and fall, and be broken, and be taken."

1 Peter ii. 7, 8 : "Unto you therefore which believe, he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner. And a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient: wherunto also they were appointed."

The Lord of hosts is a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence. But Christ was that stone of stumbling. Therefore Christ is the Lord of hosts, named by the prophet.

"And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call." Joel ii. 32.

Acts ii. 21 : And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved."

Rom. x. 13. 14 : "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have

not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?"

1 Cor. i. 2 : "Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours."

The Jehovah of the prophet Joel, is made to be Christ our Lord of the New Testament, by three distinct applications of this prophecy.

Mal. iii. 1 : "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts."

This text treats of John and Christ as is seen by the following texts.

Matt. xi. 10 : "For this is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist."

Mark, i. 2-3 : "As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight."

Luke, vi. 26. 27 : "But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet. This is he of whom it is written, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee."

I will now go back to the Hebrew text.

Mal. iii. 1. "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts."

1. The speaker in this text is the Lord of hosts—Jehovah of hosts.

2. This speaker sent John to prepare his own way for his own coming, which was to follow.

5. But it was Christ whose way John prepared and who followed him.

The conclusion is certain that Christ was the Jehovah of hosts of the Prophet Malachi.

A few texts from the New Testament will close this branch of the argument.

"The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath day." Matt. xii. 8.

The Sabbath was a positive institution, dependent upon the positive law of God, found in the fourth commandment of the Decalogue. Exo. xx.

None but the law giver could be Lord or ruler of the Sabbath, affecting its observance.

The God of the Old Testament, says over and over again, "my sabbaths." "Verily, my Sabbaths ye shall keep." Exo. xxxi. 13.

But Christ virtually calls them his. If he is Lord of the Sabbath day it is his.

None could be the Lord of the Sabbath, but the source or fountain of the law which gave existence to the Sabbath. But Christ declares himself to be the Lord of the Sabbath. Therefore he must be the source or fountain of the law.

"The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; he is Lord of all :" Acts. x. 36.

Lord of all, can mean no subordinate lord.

"The first man is of the earth, earthly; the second man is the Lord from heaven." Acts. x. 47.

The second man is without dispute no other than Christ.

Christ is therefore here called the LORD FROM HEAVEN.

"These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is Lord of lords, and Kings of kings: and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful." Rev. xvii. 14.

Here the Lord is called "LORD OF LORDS and KING OF KINGS." By "the Lord," no other being can be referred to but Christ. Therefore Christ is "the Lord of Lords and king of kings."

"And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The word of God. (The Logos of our discussion.) And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS:

Rev. xix. 13, 16.

In this passage The Logos or "Word of

God" is introduced to us "with a vesture dipped in blood." The Word is declared to be the King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

MR. MAY'S FIRST SPEECH.

Before I proceed to consider some passages of Scripture that my brother has adduced, I will notice his remarks about quotations that I brought in from Mr. Everett's work. Now I did not quote them as authority. My only purpose was to show that it was customary among the Jewish writers of the Apostles' times, to quote whatever was applicable to the subject on which they wrote, whether it was a prediction or not. But besides those cases from the Rabbis, I did quote several passages from the New Testament writers, showing plainly enough that they quoted from the Old Testament in the same manner, which my brother did not notice. I did not say that there were no passages that did distinctly predict the events to which the writers of the New Testament applied them. Some undoubtedly do. I mainly aimed to put my brother on his guard, for he had quoted passages as a fulfilment of prophecy which I do not think he will insist are such. Now I beg to be understood on this point. Mr. Lee quoted,

Rev. i. 17; xxii. 13.—"I am the first and the last. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last."

Whether in both these instances, these remarkable words were spoken by Christ, or in the former by Christ and in the latter by an angel; it seems to me that in each case the person using this language of himself must have done it as the agent, or one acting by the authority of God. Else what are we to do with the equally remarkable language used in two instances by Moses, respecting himself, Deut. xi. 13-15; xxix. 2-6.

In both of these passages, Moses used language which, if it had been used by Christ, would be stronger in proving his Deity than any brother Lee has quoted or can quote for that purpose. It seems to me, that my opponent and other Trinitarians, in their zeal to find support for their doctrine, have not carefully enough considered the peculiarly bold, figurative language of the Bible. Such passages as the one before us, if they prove what they are adduced to prove, will be found to prove much

more, and we shall be able, by the same kind of evidence, to establish the Deity of several other persons besides Christ. An argument that proves too much proves nothing.

But I by no means concede that these passages are responsible for the doctrine that is charged upon them. In both cases the application of the words "first and last" to our Lord, is so guarded as to exclude the idea of his supreme Divinity. In the 1st chapter, 17th verse, after being described as "the first and the last," we read that he said, "I am he that liveth and was dead," which would not have been said by the impassable, unchangeable God who alone hath immortality.

Any person who carefully reads the 22d chapter, it seems to me, must perceive that the speaker, in verse 13th, who said, "I am Alpha and Omega," is the same before whom John, as he tells us in verse 8th, fell down to worship him, and who forbade him in these remarkable words, (verse 9,) "See thou do it not, for I am ■ fellow servant with thee, and with thy brethren the prophets, and with them who keep the sayings of this book; worship God."

If, however, my brother on the other side does not and cannot see this as I do, I will put him upon the horns of a dilemma, though I know it will be an uncomfortable position for so good a logician as he is.

If he ascribes what is said in the 13th verse (I am Alpha and Omega,) to Jesus, and not to the angel, then must he also unavoidably ascribe to Jesus the passage coming immediately before or after it, including, of course, the 9th verse, "Thus saith he unto me, see thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant," &c., for there certainly is but one agent described by the pronoun He, in the whole train of verses, from the 6th to the 16th, who is pointed out clearly by the repetition of the phrase, "Because I come quickly," in verses 7th and 12th. In this case the passage, although it speaks of Jesus as Alpha and Omega, yet must be considered as denying him the place of Deity and ranking him among the chosen servants of God.

But if he ascribes all the verses of chapter 22, as far as verse the 16th, to the angel, he cannot justify himself in founding his conclusion respecting the Deity of Jesus, upon the 13th verse, "I am Alpha and Omega," for in

this latter case it can bear no relation to Christ, but must apply to ■ inferior angel.

The next passage introduced by my opponent was the following :—

"Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear. Surely, shall one say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength: even to him shall men come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory."—Isa. xiv. 22-25.

No one passage that my brother has quoted in support of his doctrine, did he usher into your notice, and read to you with so much emphasis, as this. These walls, you remember, resounded to his outcry, "I am God and there is none else," as if it were spoken by Christ of himself. I have no doubt of his sincerity in all that he said. I am well aware of the overweening power of one's education, particularly religious education. I presume he supposes that this passage has reference to Christ. He says, indeed, that the language upon its face concerns Christ. But I assure you I cannot see the slightest evidence of it, and think that no one of you can, if you will take the trouble to read the whole chapter for yourselves. Even the Editors of our common translation, who are very eager to find any allusion in the prophecies to Christ or the coming of his kingdom, even they were not keen eyed enough to detect anything in this chapter relating to the great Messiah, the hope of Israel, the desire of all nations. Those Editors, I say, do not intimate that there is anything in this chapter respecting the Trinity, or either the second or third person of the Triune God, or in any way respecting the coming of Christ. They tell us, in the heading of the chapter, that in it we shall find, "God calle:h Cyrus for his Church's sake, (the Jewish Church is here meant,) that by his omnipotency he challengeth obedience to the end he convinceth the idols of vanity by his saving power." You may readily ■ for yourselves that in this, and in the two preceding and subsequent chapters, the Prophet is foretelling, in his most glowing style; the deliv-

erance of the Jewish nation, who were all the Church of God as it was organized under Moses; their deliverance from bondage in Babylon. The 45th chapter commences, "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden to subdue nations before him. * * * I will go before thee and make the crooked places straight. *

* * * For Jacob, my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name. * * * I am the Lord and there is none else, there is no God beside me. I girded thee, though thou hast not known me," &c.

It was Cyrus the great—the founder of the Persian Empire. He conquered Babylon, and directed the return of the Hebrews to their native land, from which they had been exiled seventy years. This is the great event to which the whole of this chapter, and several before and after it, relate. It was attributed by the prophet to the good Providence of God in raising up such an instrument to accomplish this great purpose, and bring back his chosen people from the midst of the nations whose gods were idols, and with whom the prophet contrasts so strikingly the power and wisdom of the only living and true God.

There is not, as I have found, an intimation in all Bishop Lowth's Commentary on these chapters, that any part of them relates to Christ.

Dr. Adam Clarke, and Dr. Thomas Scott, are the only orthodox Commentators I know of, who have discovered here any allusion to Christ, though it is not improbable there may be many others of less note, for in two or three instances in this passage God is called the Saviour; and there may be many persons who suppose that to be a title exclusively belonging to Christ—and yet a not very attentive reading of our Old Testament Scriptures, was enough to find others who were called Saviours.

Joshua, especially, bore this title. His name at first was Oshea, which signifies a Saviour or salvation; but afterwards it was changed by Moses to Joshua, which signifies, he shall save, or, the salvation of Jehovah. It is the same in meaning as Jesus; and this servant of Moses, and great Saviour of the Jews in their early conflicts with the Canaanites, is twice, in the New Testament, referred to by the name Jesus. Acts viii. 45; Heb. iv. 8.

There is an expression used in this 45th chapter, which is twice quoted by St. Paul, in speaking of the submission of all men to the dominion of Christ, and persons who have not attended to the manner in which quotations are made in the New Testament from the Old, which I exhibited to you last evening, may have inferred, as my brother Lee has done, that the chapter in Isaiah, is a prophecy of Christ.

The expression I refer to is in the 23d verse of this 45th chapter of Isaiah, "that unto me every knee should bow and every tongue should swear." In the 14th chapter of Romans, 10th and 11th verses, "we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, for it is written, as I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God." Now there is no difficulty, as I have intimated before, in reconciling this passage with my doctrine of the inferiority of Christ to God. For though inferior to the Father, he was and is exalted above every other being, to be a Lord and Saviour. And as he sitteth at the right hand of God, he too will be the judge of all men. Or if we suppose that the future judgments of all men is to take place at a particular time, and to be conducted by Christ alone in person, still I believe in that case he will act as the minister, the anointed servant of God, and do whatsoever he does in God's name, and then, as St. Paul tells us, 1st Cor. xv. 24, 28, "he shall himself become subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

The other quotation of this language in Isaiah, is in Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11; and is even more unfortunate for my brother's side of the argument. It reads "wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father."

Here the being whom my brother would have me regard as the self-existent and eternal God, is said to have been highly exalted; to have had his great name given him by God; and to receive the homage of all other beings, "to the glory of God the Father."

But my brother Lee says, that this passage

in Isaiah relates to gospel times and gospel justification. As I have already said, I see not the slightest evidence of any such relation. Read the chapter and judge for yourselves.

My brother quoted Acts. xiii. 38, 9.

"Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: And by him, all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."

These verses certainly declare a great and most important truth, a part of the glad tidings of great joy. But what these verses have to do with Isaiah's announcement of the mission of Cyrus to restore the captive Israelites to their native land, and his glowing description of that event, I am utterly unable to see.

I have bestowed altogether more time upon this part of my friend's argument than it seems to me to deserve, not because I feel in the slightest degree the force of it, but because he laid so much stress upon it.

I have but eight minutes more, I will therefore not enter upon the consideration of another passage, which my brother has alleged in support of his doctrine; and which I intended to examine here, but cannot dispose of in so short a time as remains. Let me, instead, ask your attention to what he said last evening, in reply to my argument, against the evidence he alleged in the names and titles given to Christ, that similar and some of the same titles had been given to other and far inferior men. He asserted that I had not given the exact meaning of the names Eli, Eliab, Elijah, Elihu &c, though as I told him, I gave the definitions of those names which some orthodox commentators have affixed to them. But let that pass. My friend did not deny that Ithiel meant "God with me" and Lemuel "God with them" just as much as Immanuel meant "God with us." Neither did he deny that Elgibbor meant "the mighty God"—Abiad "the everlasting Father," and Sarshalom, "the Prince of Peace" as they are translated in the 9th chapter of Isaiah. These are enough for my purpose, though I believe I could show that the other names were about as well translated.

If Immanuel in the 7th chapter, and these

high titles in the 9th chapter of Isaiah, were prophetically applied to Christ, they were more certainly in their primary application bestowed upon some person or persons born in the time of the Prophet, and therefore are of no weight in proving the deity of Christ.

For this opinion I offer you Sir, very high orthodox authorities.

Hugo Grotius, (born 1583 died 1654,) of whom Dr. Adam Clarke says, "His learning was very extensive, his erudition profound, and his moderation on subjects of controversy highly praiseworthy. No man possessed a more extensive and accurate knowledge of the Greek and Latin writers, and no man has more successfully applied them to the illustration of the Sacred writings"—Grotius says on these remarkable names—"The name Immanuel denotes the certain aid of God against the Syrians and Israelites, and his preservation of the city in opposition to Sennacherib." And on the 9th chapter, 6th verse, he says: "Hezekiah, who was very unlike his father Ahaz. This passage is acknowledged, not only by Christians, but by the Chaldean interpreters, to relate in the same manner, but in a more excellent sense to the Messiah."

On these passages, the very orthodox Dr. John P. Smith, gives us the following comment. "To me, I confess, the most probable conjecture is, that the person (the Virgin) was the queen of Ahaz, to whom I further conjecture that he had then just been married, and that she was at the time beginning to be with a son, who proved a blessing to his country, and a signal honor to the house of David, namely, the pious and upright Hezekiah." Script. Text, Vol. i. p. 358.

Samuel White, M. A. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, England, author of a Commentary on Isaiah, in high repute until it was overshadowed by Lowth's—says on the 6th verse of Chap. ix: "That is he (king Hezekiah) shall reign in the throne of David, as the metaphor signifies, and as the prophet more fully explains himself in the following verse, which cannot be literally true of our Saviour, whose kingdom was not of this world, as David's was; but in a second and sublimer sense, the expression denotes that power which God

devolved on his Son, of governing his spiritual kingdom—the Church."

Now Sir, if these titles were given first to Hezekiah or some other man, I contend that the bestowment of them upon Jesus Christ is no proof that he was God.

MR. LEE'S SECOND SPEECH.

I shall continue the direct line of argument already introduced to notice. Whatever may have been said by Mr. May in reply to my former arguments, I shall reply to hereafter. And it has now been so long since the quotations criticised by him were introduced, that a brief rejoinder would not be appreciated. And I have not now sufficient time to go over them at length.

I now introduce my second direct argument in proof of the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

II. The attributes which can belong to none but the only living and true God, are all ascribed to Christ.

1 Eternity is ascribed to God, and so it is ascribed to Christ.

"But thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, *though* thou be little among the thousands of Judah, *yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.*" Micah. v. 2.

This text is applied to Christ.

"When Herod the king had heard *these things*, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judea: for thus it is written by the prophet. And thou Bethlehem, *in the land of Judea, art not the least among the princes of Judea; for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel.*" Matt. ii. 3-6.

I will next call your attention to the following:

"I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days: thy years *are* throughout all generations. Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the work of thy hands: They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed: But thou *art* the same, and thy years shall have no end." Ps. cii. 24-27.

Now this language is applied to Christ. See Heb. i. 8-12.

"But unto the Son *he saith*, Thy throne, O God, *is* for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness *is* the sceptre of thy kingdom: And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hands: They shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail."

I next adduce in testimony to be taken in connection with the former, this passage:

"Lord, thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou *hadst* formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou *art* God." Ps. lxxxx.

He who formed the earth and the world is God "from everlasting to everlasting."

Christ formed the earth and the world; therefore Christ is God from everlasting to everlasting.

Again. Look at this declaration.

"God said unto Moses, I am that I am." Exo. iii. 14. And we are informed that Jesus answered and said:

"Before Abraham *was* I am." John viii. 58.

Here the Saviour uses the very language that expresses the awful name of the True God, as he is distinguished from all that are called Gods. Who can doubt for one moment that the Saviour had his eye on the very declaration of Jehovah, and used it to identify himself with God, as one and the same being.

Yet again it is written Jehovah says, "I am the first, and I am the last; and besides me there is no God." Isa. xliv. 6. But Christ declares himself to be the first and the last.

"And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last: I *am* he that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore. Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death."

Christ's eternity is most clearly and undeniably proved by the fact that he created all things.

Here I anticipate an argument, grounded upon the fact that Christ did create all things, which shall hereafter be elaborated.

His eternity is the only point now in question, which is proved by the fact that he created all things.

"All things were made by him ; and without him was not any thing made that was made. For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers : all things were created by him, and for him ; And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." John i. 3, 16, 17.

He who created all things, must have existed before any thing was created.

He who existed before any thing was created must have always existed.

But Jesus Christ did create all things and he existed before any thing was created, therefore Jesus Christ is eternal.

2. Omnipotence is one of the essential and incommunicable attributes of Jehovah ; and this is ascribed to Christ. We have the same proof that Christ is omnipotent that we have that the Father is omnipotent.

"For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* his eternal power and Godhead : so that they are without excuse." Rom. i. 20.

The eternal power and Godhead are seen by the things that are made.

But all things were made by Christ.

Therefore the works of Christ are a development of his eternal power and Godhead.

"In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Col. ii. 9.

All the fulness of the Godhead must embrace omnipotence.

If the Godhead embraces the attribute of omnipotence and all the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth in Christ then must Christ be omnipotent.

"But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God. Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do : for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." John v. 17-19.

This text proves the omnipotence of Christ in two ways.

1. It asserts his equality with the Father.

The Jews so understood him, and he confirmed them.

2. It asserts that Christ does just what the Father does.

If God ever performed an act which nothing less than omnipotence could perform, then, as Christ performs the same acts, he must be omnipotent.

Christ clearly asserts himself to be the Almighty.

"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Rev. i. 8.

And it has been demonstrated in a former argument that Christ is the Alpha and Omega of this passage.

The very name of Jehovah which I have shown belongs to Christ, implies his omnipotence.

It cannot be pretended that Christ possessed a delegated or communicated omnipotence. Christ could not receive infinite power as a communication from the Father unless he first possessed an infinite capacity to receive and exercise it.

But an infinite capacity cannot be created. Creation must be less than the Creator.

God cannot create an equal God.

Omnipotence cannot create omnipotence.

Now as Christ did possess omnipotence : and as that could not be communicated, he must possess that omnipotence in and of himself: and therefore Christ must be God.

3. Christ possessed the attribute of Ubiquity or omnipresence.

In proof of this I quote Matt. xviii. 20. "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

Here is a declaration which is not true if Christ is not omnipresent.

"Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you : and, lo, I am with you always, *even* unto the end of the world." Matt. xxviii. 20.

Here is a promise which none but an omnipresent Jesus can fulfil.

Those ministers who deny the omnipresence of Christ, cannot pretend that he is with them in their ministrations.

"He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me : and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father ; and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. Judas saith unto him (not Iscariot,) Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and

not unto the world? Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."

Let it be understood that these promises are to every individual Christian in every part of the world.

"And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, *even* the Son of man, which is in heaven." John iii. 13.

Here Christ affirmed himself to be in heaven at the very moment he was on earth.

His body was not in heaven, but his divinity filled all in all.

The manner in which Christ is associated with Christian worship and Christian experience proves him to be omnipresent.

"Without me ye can do nothing." John xv. 5.

Nothing can then be done where Christ is not.

"I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." Phil. iv. 13.

Can Christ strengthen where he is not?

"And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in mine infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me." 2 Cor. xii. 9.

Christ said, my grace is sufficient for thee.

Christ said, my strength is made perfect in weakness.

The power of Christ rested upon Paul in his weakness.

The power of Christ cannot rest where Christ is not.

Our only access to God is through Christ.

So, as we could not worship an absent God neither can we worship God in the absence of Christ.

Christ cannot be in Unitarian assemblies and in Unitarian worship according to their theory.

If my brother May has Christ in his congregation, then the Rev. Theodore Parker, whom I understand my brother May calls a dear Son of God, cannot have him in his congregation at Boston.

Mr. May, said when did I call him a dear Son of God?

Mr. Lee answered I was so informed.

Mr. May said give your authority.

Mr. Lee said, the Rev. Mr. Phinney of this city.

4. Christ possessed the attribute of Omnipotence.

"And Jesus knowing their thoughts, said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts? Matt. ix. 4.

The marginal reading is, seeing their thoughts.

"All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Matt. ii. 27.

"As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep." John x. 15.

"All things are delivered to me of my Father: and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him." Luke x. 22.

In these texts Christ asserts that he possesses the same knowledge of the Father that the Father does of the Son.

No created being can have the knowledge of God that God has of his creatures. For who by searching can find out God? And therefore as Christ asserts that he has the same knowledge of the Father that the Father has of him, he must be God and rest with the Father in the unity of the Godhead.

"But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men; And needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man." John ii. 24, 22.

To know all men, and to know what is in man, must belong not to any created intelligence.

"But there are some of you that believe not For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him." John vi. 64.

"He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep." John xxi. 17.

The declaration is positive, "thou knowest all things."

"In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Col. ii. 3.

All the treasures of wisdom and knowledge cannot be hid in any created being.

"And unto the angel of the church in Thyatira write; These things saith the Son of God, And I will kill her children with death; and all the churches shall know that I am he which

searcheth the reins and hearts ; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works.” Rev. ii. 18, 23.

To search the hearts and try the reins of men is a work which belongs only to the allwise mind.

“ I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins ; even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings.” Jer. xvii. 10.

It can hardly be doubted that Christ referred to the words of the prophet.

5. Christ is declared to possess the attribute of immutability.

This follows from all that has been proved, but I will add a few texts on this point.

“ And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth ; and the heavens are the works of thy hands : They shall perish, but thou remainest ; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment ; And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed : but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.” Heb. i. 10-12.

This declares the immutability of Christ in words.

“ Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.” Heb. xiii. 8.

This is a positive declaration.

And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father ; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever.” Amen. Rev. i. 6.

With these remarks I close my second direct argument in favor of the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

MR. MAY'S SECOND SPEECH.

It is extremely unfortunate for my friend's argument that, notwithstanding his formidable array of texts from the Old Testament and the New, --numerous and explicit enough--which he thinks prove beyond a question, that Christ was not a created, but a self-existent, eternally existent being, possessed of all the attributes of the Deity ; it is extremely unfortunate for him, I say, that we have the most express declarations of Christ and his apostles, on every point, exactly to the contrary.

That he had not an eternal, self-existence, hear what Christ himself saith : John v. 26, 27, “ as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to his Son to have life in himself ; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man.” Gal. iv. 4: “ when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his son, made of a woman.” Collos. i. 15 :

“ who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature.” Romans i. 34 : “ his Son Jesus Christ, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh ; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead.” Rev. iii. 14: “ these things saith the Amen, the faithful and true Witness, the beginning of the creation of God.” 2 Cor. xiii. 4 : “ Though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God.”

Omnipotence. Jesus distinctly declares, that he was not in possession of this attribute. His powers mighty as they were, were all given to him ; and he who gave must have been greater than he who received them. Matt. xxviii. 18. “ All power is given to me by my Father.” John v. 19, “ The Son can do nothing of himself ;” and again, verse 30th, “ I can of mine own self do nothing.” John xvii. 2, “ As thou has given him (the Son) power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.” Matt. xx. 23 : Said Jesus “ To set on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give ; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.” John xiv. 28 : “ If ye loved me, ye would rejoice because I said I go to my Father ; for my Father is greater than I.” Acts x. 38 : “ God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power.”

Omniscience. Brother Lee quoted a number of passages to show that this divine attribute belonged to Christ. Now an omniscient being needs not to be instructed. But hear what our Saviour saith on this point. John vi. 16: “ My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me ;” and John xiv. 24 : “ The word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me.” And again, viii. 28 : “ As my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.” And even more strongly, xii. 49 : “ I have not spoken of myself but the Father who sent me, he gave me commandment, what I should say and what I should speak. Whatever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak.” However great his knowledge was, and I am not here to deny, that, of divine things, it was greater than the knowledge of any other man, yet you see Jesus declares, it was all imparted to him, and imparted knowledge must always be less than omniscience. Accordingly, we find, Matt. xxiv. 36, and Mark xiii. 23, when asked concerning a certain future event, Jesus answered, “ Of that day and that hour knoweth no man ; no, not

even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father," or "my Father only."

Infinite goodness. This also Jesus disclaimed. He seems to me to have been perfectly good. I can see no fault in him. He fills my highest conception of the perfect man. But his ideal of goodness was doubtless far higher than mine. He saw a perfection more entire than his own; and when one called him "good master," Jesus answered, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God."

Now, Mr. Chairman, what can my brother say to all this testimony, against the claims he has just set up for our beloved master? I am such a heretic, that in opposition to all the churches in Christendom, if all agreed with my brother Lee on this point, I should say, the plain declarations of Jesus himself outweigh all your texts and arguments. Nay more, I must say, that, even if I should see as my friend undoubtedly does, that prophets and apostles concurred to make Jesus in all respects equal with God, and these declarations from his own lips remained — they are, I should be compelled to believe, that Jesus was correct, and all the rest mistaken.

All the passages to which we have been listening, so earnestly urged upon us by our friend, as a proof that Christ is God—the Son is the Father—two are one, seem to me so fully disposed of by our Saviour's own testimony to the contrary, that I will now turn to another part of his argument of last evening.

The proposition, which is the subject of this discussion, requires me to believe that, "In the unity of the Godhead there are *three persons*, of one substance, power, and eternity." This doctrine is more objectionably stated in the creeds of the Presbyterian and Episcopal churches, and yet it must be believed, or at least assented to, (assent being often mistaken for belief,) as a condition of admission to the fellowship of those churches. For, notwithstanding what the 5th article of my brother Lee's creed, and the 1st chapter of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, and the 6th article of the creed of the Episcopal Church—notwithstanding what these may say of their deference to the Bible, — the ultimate rule of their faith, no man, however earnest may be his declaration of faith in the Bible, however diligently and prayerfully he may have studied it—nay, though he may draw out the several articles of his faith *in the very words of that sacred Volume*—no man will be admitted to the fellowship of any of

those churches, certainly not to the ministry in those churches, except he be willing to declare his belief that the Bible teaches what is set forth in their several creeds, and that, too, notwithstanding my brother Lee has told you and me that "those creeds are stated in language which has become obsolete; and no Trinitarian can be found, who, if he were called upon to state his views, would state them in the exact language of either of those creeds." Now this seems to me eminently unfair, that I, or any other man or woman, should be required so far to bow to the authority of any church on earth, even my brother Lee's, (which, because of its generous espousal of the cause of the enslaved, I like much better than the others,) as to accept its statement of religious truths, rather than the statements that I find in the Bible. Nay, worse, that I should be required to accept statements which those churches themselves consider out of date, old fashioned, "obsolete," that I should be required to clothe my ideas of the doctrines of the Gospel, in their old garments, which they are almost ready to cast away.

This, I aver, is to put their obsolete creeds above the Bible, and to wrap up the minds of men, so far as they can do it, in the grave-clothes of the Past. I protest against it, and shall never cease to urge my protest, until it shall seem to me unreasonable.

Yet last evening, in answer to my reasonable demand for some explicit statement of this doctrine of the Trinity, in the very words of the Great Teacher, who came from God "to bear witness to the truth," or at least in the words of some of his Apostles—a demand which I urged as all the more imperative, because the doctrine of three persons in one God is so exceedingly incongruous and apparently contradictory to the divine unity; I say, Mr. President, when I urged this reasonable demand last evening, how did my brother treat it? You remember, he told you and me, that the unity of God was as great a mystery as the Trinity; that the nature of Deity was incomprehensible by us, that his very existence was and is a profound mystery to beings such as we are; nay, more, he said, that our own existence and nature are also very mysterious. I acknowledge, of course, the truth of all he said. No sane man would contradict him. But he did not blunt the point of my demand, which is just as bright and sharp as it was before, and shall be driven home with the ~~most~~ vigor. His remarks may have clouded his own vision of what I urged; but

they did not obscure my sight in the least. Through all the mist he attempted to throw around this matter, I clearly saw the great revealed truth that "God is one," revealed to Moses and by him and the Prophets proclaimed to the world, in opposition to the Trinities of Egypt and India, and all other forms of Polytheism, I clearly saw the unity of God, re-affirmed and solemnly declared by Jesus Christ in the words of Moses, "Hear O Israel : The Lord our God is one Lord," and reiterated by himself and his Apostles at various times and in diverse manners, especially by the Apostle Paul, in that singularly explicit passage, which I hold up continually before the eyes of my brother here, and all believers in his doctrine of three persons in one God, I mean the 1st Cor. viii. 4-6, "There is none other God but one ; for though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be Gods many and Lords many) to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by him." I say, sir, through all the mist his remarks were adapted to raise about the point at issue between us, (not that he intended to obscure the truth,) through all that mist I saw clearly as ever, and see it now, the great revealed truth, that the incomprehensible "God is one," and that he is good. And I object to my brother's doctrine, not so much because it is a mystery, as because it is an *obvious contradiction*. It seems to me to declare nothing less than that there are three Gods—or certainly that "God is three." The Father who begot, the Son who was begotten, and the Holy Ghost who conceived the Son, that is, was the mother of the Son, And yet the creeds, of which this proposition before us is the foundation, tell me that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Son—the mother from her offspring. Now I solemnly affirm, that so this doctrine does appear to me, such seems to my view to be the meaning of the language of the churches—objectionable, not so much because it states what is mysterious, as because it declares what seems to me a palpable contradiction of the great central truth of revealed religion—that "God is one."

I am aware, Mr. President, that "in all departments of human inquiry we find mystery, something hidden from us, and beyond our present reach, and it would be strange if religion were an exception to the general rule. It is not. "All the subjects of which it treats are by their nature beyond our perfect comprehen-

sion. We may learn something of them, enough for present guidance, and comfort and encouragement, and that is all. God, Eternity, Immortality, Redemption, Accountability, Judgment—what infinite verities do these words convey, yet how completely are we overwhelmed in their contemplation ! There is not one of them that we can perfectly explain." Our own souls, as my brother said last evening, are an unfathomable mystery to us ; how then can we expect to find out to perfection the natures of God and of Christ ? I have no such expectation, I make no such demand. I go to the study of the Bible with reverential feelings, trusting that I shall find enough for my salvation ; not expecting to know all things. But what is distinctly revealed I do expect to know—what is revealed can be no longer a mystery. It is a mystery to me, how all this vegetable world that now lies so dead about us is to be revived, and clothed with the verdure, and bring forth the fruits of the new year. But the revelation of the glorious fact, that it will be so restored, has been made to me more than fifty times, and I believe the fact, and so am undismayed by this seeming death. *The fact* is revealed to me. I know it, I am sure of it. *The how* all this beautiful and wonderful change shall come over the vegetable world, is still unrevealed—is still a mystery. I know nothing certainly about it. I have some opinions, and will pursue my researches further into the hidden truth as I may have opportunity. But I shall never find it out to perfection. *The fact*, however, is enough for all practical purposes, and that is no mystery. If a philosopher should tell me that the influences of light and heat, upon certain properties in the soil, produced the effect, I should believe, though it would leave *the process* still a mystery. But if he should tell me that the influences of light and heat, under the same circumstances, were destructive to vegetable life, I should demur, because the latter statement is contradictory to the former.

Mystery and contradiction you see, Mr. Chairman, are very different things. The union between God and Christ is a subject beyond our perfect comprehension—it is therefore a mystery ; but as Christ has declared that he could "do nothing of himself," and he "spake not of himself," but only "as the Father gave him commandment," that "all power was given to him," I cannot help thinking, that those who assert he was equal with the Father, and independent in his authority, are in error. This seems

to contradict his plain assertions respecting himself. So when Christ asserts, that he did not know of a future event—the day of judgment—(Mark xiii. 32,) the assertion of my brother Lee, that he was nevertheless omniscient, is evidently a denial of what he said. The limits of Christ's knowledge I cannot define, but he plainly asserted that some limits do exist, which was a distinct denial of omniscience.

Now again, in regard to the proposition we are discussing, Moses and the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles, teach and reiterate in various ways the great truth that *God is one*. The proposition of my brother Lee declares that he is three. Here, then, is not so much a mystery as a contradiction. And it is the contradiction I object to, more than the mystery. There may be a great sublime truth in a mystery, but there can be no truth in a contradiction. Still the Wesleyan Church, and all other self-styled orthodox churches, hold up this contradiction to be believed, and will account no man a Christian, who does not at least profess to believe what seems to me to contradict the plainest declarations of the Bible. I offer them my faith respecting God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, expressed precisely in the language used by Christ and his Apostles. But they reject that, and insist upon their creeds. I reply, show me the doctrine of your creed expressed in the words of Christ or his Apostles, just as I am to receive it, and I will assent to it as true, and do my best to believe it. So I have said again and again. So said that holy and learned man, Dr. Watts, the author of the Psalms and Hymns that are used in most of our churches. I read you, last evening, an extract from his most touching address to the Deity on this very point. In it he alleges, that, if this doctrine of the Trinity be true, it is nowhere stated in the Bible so precisely, that he knows how to receive it, and there is much else there which seems utterly irreconcileable with such a doctrine. I read that touching appeal to show you, sir, that other and more enlightened, and every way better men than I am, find the same difficulty with myself, and turning, as I do, to the Bible, ask to have the doctrine of the Trinity shown to them stated there as it is to be believed.

Brother Lee met that solemn appeal from Dr. Watts, with the slighting remark, that the Dr. was not much of a theologian—that he was a poet rather than a Biblical scholar—more than intimating that poets were not apt to know much about Divinity. Brother Lee forgot himself in

that hasty remark. He forgot that Moses (if he were, as many believe him to have been, the author of the book of Job,) was one of the sublimest poets that ever lived: that David, with all his glaring faults of character, was a great poet, and yet, if he wrote the Psalms must have been a great theologian, too; and that the Prophets, one and all of them, clothed most of their sublime doctrines and glowing anticipations in poetry!

Mr. Lee—Ah! they were inspired by God.

Mr. May—And are not all true poets inspired?

But this is aside from our subject. To Dr. Watts' and to my own most reasonable demand for at least one distinct statement of the doctrine of the Trinity from the Bible. All that my brother Lee has hitherto done, and all that he will be able to do, if we continue our discussion until the close of the year, will be to bring forward from the Scriptures divine titles, that were bestowed upon Christ very much as they were by the Hebrews, upon some of their prophets, princes, and Judges; ascriptions of power, wisdom, goodness to Christ, that would seem to be attributable only to God. But, in most instances, the context of such passages show at a glance, that all such ascriptions of divine attributes and divine offices to Christ are made in subordination to his Father and our Father—his God and our God.

FOURTH EVENING—MARCH 7.

MR. LEE'S FIRST SPEECH.

In resuming the discussion after several days intermission, I wish to indicate my line of policy for time to come. I am satisfied that public sentiment requires us disputants to confine ourselves to the question in issue, and not to leave it to discuss other matters.

As I have the affirmative, and have the care to make out, it is absolutely required of me to spread my arguments before those who choose to hear, whether they are immediately replied to or not.

I cannot control Mr. May in regard to his time and manner of replying. I would not, if I could. They are rightfully his own; subject to the judgment of the people who come to hear us.

Now, as he has not seen fit to reply to my arguments in the consecutive order in which I have introduced them, but has offered replies to some portions of them, and other portions not noticed, so that, some of my earliest arguments remains unnoticed, while some of the latter

ones have been attempted to be replied to—breaking up the chain of my argument, so that I cannot defend them in the order in which I have advanced them; I feel myself driven to a course, which I have no doubt will increase the interest of the discussion.

I shall leave my rejoinders, or, what you may call my replies to Mr. May, until the conclusion of my direct arguments; and then, reply, by defending my arguments against his attacks upon them, in the same chain like order in which I advance them. I shall only correct some errors in matter of fact, make some brief explanations, or, announce what will be the ground of my reply on a given point, and then press on with my direct argument to its close.

A few points in matters past require a notice before I take up my line of argument.

The creed question has been forced upon this discussion by Mr. May. In his last address he made this distinct point which he pressed with great earnestness. That the doctrine of the Trinity being placed in the creed, none can join the church who do not believe it.

This is a misapprehension of the question in discussion. The question is not, is it right to make creeds; but is the doctrine of the Trinity true. There are those who will maintain that it is not proper to write it as part of a creed, even if they believe it be true. The question is not, is it right to exclude a person from the church, because he does not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, but is that doctrine true. Mr. May battled against the exclusion of persons from the church, by creeds as though that were the question. Does he not know better, or does he do it to divert attention from the real issue?

Another point which is foreign to the question, is, his labored defence of the poets, as theologians. The only point he made here, is his reference to the poetry of inspired men, ■ Moses and David, to prove that uninspired poets are likely to be good theologians. Moses and David &c. This second attempt which he has made during this discussion, to lay uninspired authors by the side of the writers of the Scriptures, ■ of equal importance and authority, will not fail to leave its impressions on your minds, in regard to his views of the inspiration of the Scriptures.

The first case ■ his reference to the ■ in which Rabbies quote from the Old Testament in proof of the sense in which the writers of the New Testament quote.

This second attempt is more significant, if possible, for when I suggested that Moses and David were inspired by God, he replied in defense of his favorite Dr. Watts, "Are not all poets inspired?"

Mr. May here said, "All *true* poets" was my remark.

Mr. Lee. Very well. All true poets let it be. Thus did he place Watts and all true poets by the side of Moses, David, Isaiah, Matthew Mark, Luke, John, Peter and Paul.

But his own argument overwhelms him. Most of the poets have been Trinitarians, and Dr. Watts enjoyed all his poetic inspiration while ■ Trinitarian, and then after the Muses had departed from him, in his old age, he became ■ Unitarian.

"All true poets are inspired" says Mr. May. Listen then to the glorious effusions of the inspiration of Dr. Watts.

"Glory to God the Trinity,

Whose name has mysteries unknown ;
In essence One, in person Three ;
A social nature, yet alone."

"To praise the Father, and the Son,
And Spirit all divine,
The One in Three, and the Three in One,
Let saints and angels join"

"To God the Father, God the Son,
And God the Spirit, Three in One,
Be honor, praise and glory given,
By all on earth, and all in heaven."

"Honor to the Almighty Three,
And everlasting One ;
All glory to the Father be,
The Spirit, and the Son."

To our eternal God,

The Father, and the Son,
And Spirit, all divine,
Three mysteries in one,

Salvation, power, By all on earth,
And praise be given, And all in heaven."

I will now notice one of his arguments which really belongs to the question.

I argued that Christ possessed all the attributes by which God is distinguished. To this he pretended to reply. But I answer

1. That reply was but partial. ■ made five distinct attributes, and he replied in regard to only three of them—Eternity, Omnipotence and Omiscience. I noticed Omnipresence and immutability, the first of which told with more power on the theory he advocates than any

other argument ; these he passed in silence, while he replied on the ground of infinite goodness, as though I had urged the sinlessness of Christ, about which I said not one word (1) This may appear strange, but it will be explained in a moment.

2. This reply, ■ far as it went, was based upon a false principle of reasoning. It did no more than to array one class of texts against another. No attempt was made to examine my arguments, nor to examine the texts I quoted to show that they did not mean what I supposed them to mean. But other texts were quoted which he supposed asserted something else. This tends merely to array the Bible against itself, and to destroy confidence in its inspiration. To illustrate, I quoted, "Lord, thou knowest all things." "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father;" and he quotes in reply, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels in heaven, nor the son, but my Father only." Now he gains nothing by this, as I will show you.

(1.) If both texts are true, he gains nothing, for then it follows that he knows all things, and that he has the same knowledge of the incomprehensible Father, that the Father has of him, which implies all that I contend for, and my argument remains untouched, since all that I contend for is consistent with his texts.

(2.) If both text are not true, his texts are ■ likely to be false as mine, and of course he gains nothing in the argument. In attempting to destroy the credibility of my witness, there is an equal doubt thrown over his own.

(3.) If he claims a victory on the ground that his texts are true and mine are not, which is the only ground upon which he can claim the argument, he reaps his victory over the ruin of the Bible, which he appears about [as anxious to overthrow as he does the Trinity.]

(4.) While his success depends upon making it appear that a large portion of the Bible does not mean what it says, my success depends upon my being able to harmonize all these texts, and to save the whole Bible—Of which he does not seem to be very choice.

This I trust I shall do in due time.

But let me show you the weakness of this method of argumentation.

He quoted in opposition to my views of Christ's power, his words to his disciples, "Greater works than these shall ye do." Now this proves that the apostles had more power than Christ, or it does not prove how much, or

how little power he had ; in which case it does not meet my argument. He must then admit that he has proved Christ inferior to the apostles, or admit that he has not met my argument. But the main point is this ; he quotes—"greater than these shall ye do." Now suppose I adopt his method of reply, and quote Christ's words, "without me ye can do nothing." Is anything gained by thus opposing text to text. Certainly not, it is a false method of arguing.

3. His reply assumes that to prove that Christ was man, is to prove that he is not God. The theological system of which the Trinity is ■ part, contends that Christ was both God and man ; and I will proceed to this point in due time. Christ is presented in the Scriptures in a three fold point of light. As God, as man, and as God and man united in one Christ. Again, he is seen in a three fold position corresponding to the former. In the light of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was ; then in the light of his humility and suffering ; and then in the light of his exaltation to the throne after his resurrection as the humanity participating in the glory and authority of the throne, as a reward of its redeeming sufferings.

Keep these distinctions in view, and all those otherwise apparently contradictory texts will be harmonized. And it will be observed,—it ■ my effort to make the Scriptures harmonize, but his course is to array one class of texts against another. I submit, that it is ■ dangerous work. Those who embrace a system, the defence of which is a constant work of arraying Bible against Bible, cannot fail, however imperceptibly, to weaken their own faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures. Whether those who have adopted such ■ theory, do or do not, already exhibit less confidence in the inspiration of the Scriptures, I will leave others to determine by the light of common observation.

The texts which he has quoted in reply to ■ on the attributes of Christ, are absolutely ■ essential to my theory ; they are the very texts which I shall quote to prove the humanity of Christ. He is thus urging against me, that upon which I rely for support. I affirm that Christ is both God and man, and he replies that he is not God, because he is man. Is this fair argumentation ? This matter we will settle hereafter.

4. I have one more point of light in which to consider his reply on the attributes of Christ. My rejoinder what remains of it, is contained

in a single text of Scripture, which you may find in 2 Kings vi. 5. It reads thus, "Alas master, for it was borrowed." It was read from a printed tract, or argument, Entitled, "Our Lord Jesus Christ; By William Elliott Jr." It does not contain any notice of the argument concerning the Omnipresence and immutability of Christ, but did contain a notice of his goodness about which I said nothing; and that is the probable reason why Mr. May's reply was of the partial character.

I do not bring this as an objection to Mr. May's course, he had a perfect right so to do, and I do not and will not complain. I only claim that it as my right to have the audience know with whom I debate. My friend is welcome to bring whom he pleases, living or dead, only let it be known with whom I am engaged in controversy and I will be content.

One point more—He talked about placing me upon the horns of a dilemma about the conception of Christ by the Holy Ghost, but I must confess, he left so much darkness about the subject that I have not been able to find either horn of his dilemma to get upon it, and will claim his indulgence while I ask an explanation of his views in relation to the origin and nature of Jesus Christ.

1. Had Jesus, the Son of Mary, a human father, or was his conception wholly miraculous, being accomplished by the power of the Holy Ghost.

This was said after turning toward Mr. May, who replied, "I believe that Jesus Christ was the Son of Joseph and Mary."

2. Was the elemental nature of Christ entire and complete human nature, and no more than perfect human nature?

Mr. May said, "I believe that he was a perfect man."

3. Did Christ possess conscious existence before he was born of Mary, or did he commence existence with her?

Mr. May said, "Touching that matter I am in doubt. I am not clear whether or not all men existed prior to this present life. I am however inclined to the Humanitarian idea of the nature of Christ—that he was only a man."

Mr. Lee then remarked. I have still one more question for my friend to answer if he pleases.

4. What is the Holy Ghost of which, the angel said to Joseph, in reference to Mary's prospective Son; "that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost?" The question is what is that Holy Ghost?

Mr. May replied; "I believe that it was the spirit of God."

I have now said all I deem it necessary to, until I close my direct arguments, which I now resume.

III. The works which none but God can do were performed by Christ.

1. Creation was performed by Christ.

This has been involved in proving other points, but shall now be made the point of discussion.

I make it distinctly here, because it is very essential to the chain of argument I have proposed to furnish in favor of the Deity of Christ.

"All things were made by him and without him was not any thing made that was made." John i. 3.

There is an explicit text, which my friend has so often insisted upon my giving him, and such explicit texts he shall have to the end of the discussion.

Mr. May said, "an explicit text in favor of the doctrine of the Trinity I asked.

Mr. Lee said, If an explicit text cannot prove one thing it cannot prove another. If he will not receive an explicit text in favor of a portion of the argument which is essential to the theory, he will not accept one in favor of the entire theory—nor can he reasonably demand it. But I hold him to his contract now and shall hold him there to the end of the discussion.

"He was in the world and the world was made by him." Verse 10.

"In whom we have redemption through his blood even the forgiveness of sins; Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col. i. 14 15.

Great stress was laid upon the first clause of this text. But this can mean nothing to the purpose of my friend, unless it means the first created of every creature.

This cannot be however because:—

1. According to my theory, his divine nature was never created.

2. According to the theory of my friend, he was not the first created. Adam was created four thousand years before he was. Abraham was created about two thousand years before Christ.

3. The expression, "first born of every creature" has reference to rank and not age or pre-existence.

Mr. May said—"Very well so I think."

"For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren." Rom. viii. 29.

First-born, here means the chief or head of all the redeemed and saved. So in verse 18, following the ones quoted above.

"And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence."

MR. MAY'S FIRST SPEECH.

Mr. chairman, I cannot show how inapplicable the arguments of my brother Lee are, in his review of my reply, without going over my arguments entire, and I prefer to leave the matter for the present as it now stands. What I attempted to show was, that the Saviour, by his own language, disclaimed all such attributes as my brother Lee attached to him by the quotations he applied to him. He aimed to lessen the impression made by the words of the Saviour, which I introduced by telling you it was read from a printed pamphlet. And so it was. For there the texts were to my hand, and I read them, making such running comments as I thought proper. I have these words of Christ, and gave them to you to weigh against the inferences my opponent drew from the passages he quoted and employed to make out his arguments.

There were many things in Mr. Lee's remarks that are not worthy of reply—all that about poetry, for instance. I am willing you should judge whether Dr. Watts had lost either his inspiration or his piety, before becoming a Unitarian. His words are before you. They shall speak.

I am sorry not to go on in reply to the line of argument directly. But my brother Lee has laid the necessity upon me by his course in this discussion.

Before I proceed to examine the arguments which my brother Lee has offered this evening, I must devote some time to certain things that he said when we were last here. One of them, at least, is wholly irrelevant, and you must hold my opponent responsible for its introduction.

Rather abruptly, quite unnecessarily, and it seemed to me, somewhat roguishly, my brother brought me up against what he seemed to think

a theological stump, that I could neither get over nor around.

In order, sir, that Mr. Lee and the audience may know that I have a little learning on this point, I will give it first in the Greek language. It was "Theta epsilon omicron delta omicron rho eta, Pi alpha rho kappa epsilon rho," which being done into plain English, is neither more nor less than *Theodore Parker*, the great bug-bear of the American Church. Mr. Lee held him up to you as the model Unitarian, and the most illustrious theologian in our denomination.

Mr. Lee—My friend is mistaken. I did not hold Mr. Parker up as a model Unitarian, much less as a great theologian. I could not so belie my idea of a theologian. "You misrepresent me."

Mr. May—What did you say, then?

Mr. Lee—I said distinguished Unitarian.

Mr. May—You said distinguished theologian.

Mr. Lee—Oh, no! You misunderstood me.

Mr. May—I am sure you did.

Mr. Lee—if I said so I will take it all back, for I will not stultify my own common sense by saying or persisting in saying anything like that.

Mr. May—I certainly understood friend Lee as commanding Mr. Parker as a prominent member of the Unitarian denomination, and distinguished as an expounder of Unitarianism. Whatever may be his opinion of him, Mr. Parker is a very distinguished theologian, and man, perhaps, of more varied and extensive learning than any other man in our country. He believes, on some points, as Unitarians do, but on several other very important points he has departed widely from the faith which they deem essential. He has been repudiated and denounced by all the Unitarian ministers of Boston and the vicinity. It is not their fault, that he often has the largest congregation that assembles to hear any Protestant preacher in these United States, not excepting the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, his only rival in this respect. The Boston Association worked quite an ingenious traverse to get him out of their body, and the American Unitarian Association have run the risk of almost setting up a creed, in order so to define their position that it could not possibly be confounded with his. I shall present my brother Lee with a copy of the declaration of their faith, that he may never again make so great a mistake as to identify Mr. Parker with the Unitarians. It is as unfair as it would be to class Dr. Bushnell or Dr. Edward Beecher, with the Princeton theologians. Why,

sir, since 1845, I know of but three Unitarian ministers in the country, besides myself, who have preached in Mr. Parker's pulpit, or invited him to preach in their pulpits. On us four, therefore, and no more, let the condemnation rest of having given the hand of fellowship to Theodore Parker. The Unitarians, as ■ body, I am sure have done enough, and more than enough, to exonerate themselves from this grave charge. For myself, sir, I am ready, here or anywhere else, to avow my respect and love for that great heresiarch, notwithstanding that I differ widely from him in theological belief. And I shall be happy, here or anywhere else, to give my reasons for the regard in which I hold him—reasons which I am sure my brother Lee will appreciate and honor, if no one else in this assembly does.

And for what purpose, sir, did my opponent introduce Theodore Parker the other evening? It was, that he might tell us, on the high authority of that gentleman, that the Unitarians have the art of explaining away whatsoever they find in the Bible, that contradicts their own reason. If, sir, this be ■ reproach, and if it really attaches to the Unitarians, it lies against all other Protestant denominations, just as much as against us. In fact, sir, the whole body Protestant set us a glaring example in this direction, and the diverse sects into which that body has got divided have only followed that example.

Where is there to be found, in all the Bible, ■ more explicit, or so emphatic a declaration of any doctrine, as of the great Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation. I will turn, sir, to the 6th chapter of John, and read to you from the 48 to the 56th verse, inclusive.

"I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that ■ man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven, if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.

Then turn to Matt. xxvi. 26, and read, that at the last supper with his disciples, Jesus "took bread and blessed it, and brake it and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat, *this is my body.*" In like manner, "he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, *this is my blood.*"

Now, sir, my friend on the other side has not produced, and he cannot produce from the Bible one passage in which his doctrine of the Trinity is so plainly, so emphatically declared as the doctrine of Transubstantiation is declared in the passages I have just read, and yet the whole Protestant world rejects this Popish doctrine, not because it lacks proof from holy writ, (for it were impossible to desire language that should state any doctrine more clearly and emphatically,) but because the doctrine itself contradicts reason—nay, is a violent absurdity. But before Him, who knows the sincerity of my words, I aver that the Roman Catholic doctrine, which would have us believe that at the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the bread and wine, by some mysterious, miraculous change, becomes the body and blood of Jesus does not seem to me so violently, aye, so fearfully absurd as the doctrine of the Trinity, because I know that the body and blood of a man are composed of the same chemical elements that are to be found in bread and wine. But my brother Lee asks me to believe, that in God there are three persons, and yet but one person; that is to say, as the language means to my understanding, three Gods and yet but one God. Nay, more, in his creed, of which this is the basis, he calls upon me to believe that the same being was both infinite and finite in his attributes, having all power, and yet being incapable of himself of doing anything omniscient: knowing all things, and yet ignorant of some things: the holiest one, and yet not good in comparison with another being, to whom he referred; incapable of suffering, and yet sweating blood in his agony; nay, more, this marvellous doctrine (so far as I can understand the meaning of the language in which it stands in all the creeds of the orthodox churches,) requires me to believe that the Creator, preserver, constant supporter of the universe, incarnated himself in the womb of a virgin, became ■ man, dwelt among men, received their adoration as Jehovah, then expired on the cross, and laid parts of three days in the tomb. This doctrine, so self-contradictory, so incomprehensible, my brother Lee, and the other orthodox ministers require me to believe,

upon evidence far less explicit than that which the Catholic Church offers for its doctrine of Transubstantiation, but which, nevertheless, they and the whole Protestant world reject, because it is absurd, and they explain the passages on which it rests to mean something else.

Then, sir, there is the doctrine of Baptism; what plain example have we, throughout the New Testament, of any instance of Baptism being administered to infants, or in any other mode than one which required the recipient to go down into the water? And yet, sir, more than half the orthodox Protestant world have rejected that scriptural doctrine, explaining away the texts on which it rests, and the time was when the Baptists were hated and persecuted worse than the Unitarians now are. But, bolder yet; the only Sabbath instituted in the Bible, was the day of rest on the Seventh day. Not a syllable is to be found in the New Testament, requiring or authorizing the change to the first day of the week, and yet the whole Christian world have dared to make that change, excepting a very small remnant, who still observe the seventh day.

I might, sir, if there were time, adduce quite a number more of instances, in which the Protestant world, in the exercise of the right of private judgment, have set at nought the obvious meaning of passages in the Bible, and explained them away, because that meaning was contradictory to reason. Sir, they who live in such a glass house as the whole Protestant Church is, should not throw stones at those of us who find ourselves impelled, in the exercise of our spiritual liberty, to put up a simpler theological fabric than that which was reared by Calvin, or the Westminster Divines, or the founder of the English Church, upon the foundation which Athanasius or St. Augustine laid. For the same stone they hurl at us may be thrown upon them by the Catholic Church, and grind them to powder. There is no consistent stopping place, Mr. chairman, between the Roman Catholic Church, which assumes to teach the people all they need to know, from a source higher than the Bible, and the position which we Unitarians take, that every individual should be urged to go to Jesus and learn of him, and left to be fully persuaded, in his own mind, of any doctrine he is called upon to receive. My good friend, General Granger, who has denounced me so flippantly as an infidel, and his pastor, the Rev. Mr. Ashly, who has held me up, from his pulpit, to the dread of his people, and

then published the discourse containing strange misrepresentations of my principles and doctrines, I say, sir, these gentlemen must go (as a considerable number of Episcopalian in England have gone,) back into the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church, or else continue to live, as they now do, in a glass house with windows broken to pieces by the recoil of the stones they have thrown at me. I say once more, we Protestants, of every name, must go back into the lap of mother church, and there shut our eyes and open our mouths, and swallow what she may give us to make us wise, or else, sir, like men in understanding, we must open our own eyes, look after God in nature and revelation, that we may find him and the *eternal verities*: those everlasting principles of impartial righteousness and love on which the pillars of God's moral government rest, and on which the present and eternal welfare of every rational and moral being depends.

I am sorry that I have been drawn away so long from the precise topic we are discussing, but I have said no more than Mr. Lee's quotation from Mr. Parker required that I should say.

Let us now return, sir, to the arguments which Mr. Lee offered here last Thursday evening. After he had made some replies to what I had said the evening before, he resumed the quotation of passages from the Bible, in support of the proposition, that in "unity of the Godhead there are three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity." All that he had said, hitherto, had been intended only to prove the Deity of Christ. And thus did he attempt, still further, to establish this part of his proposition.

In Joel i. 32, we read, "it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered; for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall deliverance," &c.

In Acts i., Peter declared the occurrences on the day of Pentecost, to be a fulfilment of the prophecy in Joel: and particularly the 21st verse said, "it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved."

This seemed to my brother to be proof positive, that the same person is indicated in both places under the name of "the Lord," and that that person was Jesus Christ. But, if my friend had only read to you a few of the verses that follow the 21st verse of this 1st chapter of Acts, you would have seen that Jesus could not have been considered by Peter as "the Lord," in the

sense of Jehovah, for he speaks of him as "a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him," as having "been crucified and slain," and as one whom "God hath raised up," and as being "by the right hand of God exalted."

Nor would my brother have strengthened the argument he endeavored to hold up, by this chain of texts, if he had read the context of the one that he adduced from Rom. x. 13, 14, for in the 9th verse of that same chapter he would have read, "if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." How then can he ask me to believe that a being who died, who was raised from the dead, and exalted to the right hand of God, was himself that very same eternal, unchangeable, impassible Jehovah who raised Jesus from the dead. He may ask me if he will, but I cannot gratify him so much as to yield my convictions to evidence that is so easily dissipated.

Malachi iii. 1, "Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me, and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in; behold he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts."

If there is any reliance to be placed upon the rules of grammar, Mr. chairman, we need not look beyond this text itself, to see that there is no evidence here of the doctrine it was adduced to prove. Nothing can be plainer in a compound sentence, than that two persons are spoken of in this verse by the name of "the Lord"—one the Lord, *even the messenger of the covenant*, and the other the *Lord of Hosts*. I need only to read it to you again. It is unnecessary, therefore, to go with my brother into the examination of the texts he quoted from Matt. xi. 10, 11, Mark i. 2, 3, for I have no dispute with him as to what is there asserted. I believe Jesus came in the name of the Lord, and I know he was often called Lord; but that proves nothing but what we have seen and said a hundred times, that the titles of God are often given to his messengers and prophets.

Exodus xxxi. 13, "Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily, my Sabbath ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you."

Matt. xii. 8, "For the Son of man is Lord, even of the Sabbath day."

The argument of my brother, based on these texts taken in connection, was that, as Jesus, the Son of man, is Lord of the Sabbath day, therefore he must be identically the same being who instituted the Sabbath and commanded its observance.

Undoubtedly, among the powers given to Jesus by God, was "the power to establish a system of religion under which the Sabbath would be changed from a day of physical rest to one of spiritual awakening. He could, therefore, grant a freedom to his disciples unknown to the scrupulous Pharisees."

In Mark i. 27, Jesus has put this matter in the clearest light. "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath day." Here we have a plain intimation of the reason why authority was given him to dispense with some of the restrictions imposed by the Mosaic law.

But if my friend's reasoning will hold good to prove Christ the original founder of the Sabbath, because authority over it was given to him, then shall we be able, in the same way, to prove that other men are God. Let me give you only one out of many illustrations, for it does not seem to me worth while to spend much time upon an argument like this.

In the 50th Psalm, 7th and 10 verses, we read, "Hear O my people, and I will speak; O Israel, and I will testify against thee; I am God, even thy God." * * * 10, Every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills." But in Psalm viii. 5, we read, "O Lord our Lord,"—"thou hast made him (man) a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet; all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field," &c. Here we certainly have as explicit an assurance as can be given, of the transfer of the dominion of all things, especially over animals, from God to man; and yet, who would argue thence that the beings, God and man, are identical?

Acts x. 36 "The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; he is Lord of all." Read to the 43d verse.

You see from the context that the person spoken of as Lord of all, was an inferior, dependent being, to the God of Israel; that from him he received that *anointing* which enabled him

to do what he did ; by him he was raised from the dead on the third day, and by him—by God—he was ordained to be the judge of quick and dead."

This clause, "He is Lord of all," was thrown in, as numerous Trinitarian writers concede, not to declare the Deity of Jesus Christ, but to express still further the reigning thought of the whole passage : that the Messiah was not the Messiah of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles. "These parenthetical words," says Dr. Owen, whose orthodoxy was never doubted, "are of great weight, and were meant to prove that what Christ preached to the Jews was equally applicable to the Gentiles."

Dr. Pyle, a distinguished man in the English Church about a hundred years ago, expounded this passage in the same way. And the Rev. Dr. George Hill, Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, commented thus on this passage—"That (that Christ is now Lord of all,) was made manifest by the extraordinary gifts with which he endowed the first preachers of his religion—gifts sufficient to prove that all power in heaven and in earth is now given to him ; but not sufficient to establish with certainty any conclusion which extends to his state previous to the time of his receiving that power." (See Trinitarian Confessions, page 402.)

If what is said here in the context, were not of itself alone sufficient to show the dependence, the inferiority of Jesus Christ to God, the context of the passage quoted by my brother as the next link of this chain of proof would settle this point. 1st Cor. xv. 47, "The first man is of the earth, earthly ; the second man is the Lord from heaven." Of this Lord from heaven it is said in the 24th verse of this same chapter, "then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father," and in the 28th verse, "when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

But my brother would draw us by the next link of his chain, Rom. xvii. 14, to the conclusion that the same person now called (as I grant Jesus often is called,) the Lamb, is indeed the Lord of Lords and the King of Kings, for so it reads. It happens, very unfortunately for my friend's argument based on this passage, that if he will turn to Ezekiel xxvi. 7, he will find that a person no more lamb-like than Nebuchadnezzar, was once dignified by a similar title : "For thus saith the Lord God, Behold I will bring

upon Tyrus Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, a king of kings, from the North, with horses and with chariots," &c.

A reference to the same passage will reduce, in like manner, the value of the evidence in support of his doctrine, which Mr. Lee would draw from Rev. xix. 16, where the same high title, king of kings, is said to have been on the vesture and the thigh of him, who a few verses before had been called the Word of God. No careful reader of the Bible, unless too intent upon proving a favorite doctrine, would rest the truth of so weighty a proposition as the one we are discussing, upon the titles that are bestowed upon distinguished persons. The Hebrews and the Orientals were very extravagant in this particular.

MR. LEE'S SECOND SPEECH.

Mr. Lee said, When I closed my previous remark, I had just entered upon the argument that the works which none but God can do were performed by Christ. The point under notice then was, that he created all things. I will now quote the words of Him whom my friend will admit is Jehovah. The words of God the Father speaking of the Son. He says :

"Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth ; and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure ; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment ; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed : But thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end." Ps. cii. 25-27.

Now in Heb. i. 8, Paul quotes the entire passage from the Psalms, and declares that "God saith it unto the Son," and adds :

"Thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands." Heb. i. 10.

Here it appears that he whom my friend says was the Son of Joseph and Mary, God declares laid the foundation of the earth, and with his hands made the earth and heaven. Now I leave it with you to decide which is right, my friend who affirms one thing, or God the Father, in what is said here of the Son.

2. The work of Providence, or upholding and sustaining all things, is ascribed to Christ.

"Upholding all things by the word of his power." Heb. i. 3.

"By him all things consist." Col. i. 17.

Now, I repeat this text. "Upholding all things by the word of his power." But it has been said that Jesus told his disciples—"Greater works shall ye do !" There is a very impor-

tant difference however in the manner of doing his works and those attributed to his Apostles. Jesus Christ did his mighty works in his own name. No other person ever did this. When ■ apostle performed a miracle he said "Jesus maketh thee whole." But if Christ performed the work he said, I say unto thee," ■ in the case of the bed-ridden man—"I say unto thee arise take up thy bed and walk." In his own name he spoke to the storm tossed wave "Be still."

His providential power and care is seen in many of the miracles he performed. He silenced the winds, and stilled the waves, and broke the slumbers of death.

To govern and uphold all things he must be every where, and possess almighty power.

Now how can he uphold all things--how can all things consist or subsist by him if he is not every where? And if he is every where present he must be God. Some tell ■ about the supremacy of nature's laws. But what are the laws of nature? They are simply God in nature manifesting himself any where. And if Jesus Christ is upholding all things, and if by him all things consist, he must be every where present in nature, and must be God. He must ride upon every zephyr that wafts its fragrant breath on the mountain and along the plain.—He it is who gives to the flower its blooming tints of every hue—He is seen glowing in the radiant sun beam—And without him the heart would cease to throb and send the life renewing current through artery and vein—And in the absence of his power the universe would be without law, and every shining orb would miss its path and cease to roll along the ethereal way ; for He "upholdeth all things by the word of his power ; and by him all things consist."

Now these are explicit texts for my friend. Night after night successively he has called for explicit texts. Well: Here they are. Surely he has them here.

3. He pardoned sinners, which God only can have a right to do.

"When Jesus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee. But there were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts. Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? who can forgive sins but God only? And immediately, when Jesus perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, he said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts? Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the

palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee ; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins."

The Jews asserted that none but God could forgive sin.

Christ did not contradict it, but showed that he had the power.

When Christ pardoned that sinner, he ascended the throne above the law, and silenced its voice and hushed its thunder.

IV. The worship which belongs only to God is rendered to Christ.

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth : Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them : for I the Lord thy God ■ a jealous God." Exo. xx. 3-5.

"Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan : for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Matt. iv. 10.

These passages are quoted simply to show that worship is only lawful when offered to God. Towards all other beings it is forbidden. Now let us see if Christ may not be worshipped—and indeed, whether we are not commanded to worship him.

"Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but ■ little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." Psalm ii. 12.

"Saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him. And when they were come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother, and fell down, and worshipped him : and when they had opened their treasures, they presented unto him gifts ; gold and frankincense, and myrrh. Matt. ii. 2, 11,

"And behold there came ■ leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." Matt. viii. 2.

"Then they that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God." Matt. xiv. 33.

Now observe. The Lord did not rebuke them for worshipping him. And again this worship was proffered to him after they had seen the wonderful and Godlike power that he exerted in stilling the stormy wave.

"And ■ they went to tell his disciples, behold

Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him." Matt. xxviii. 9.

"And when they saw him, they worshipped him, but some doubted." Matt. xxviii. 17.

"And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven, And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy." Luke xxiv. 51, 52.

Here the worshipping disciples were yet in the presence of the bright cloud on which he passed away from them to heaven. In full view of the bursting glories of that vision and filled with the inspiration of the scene they worshipped him. And He is a being worthy of the worship of earth and heaven, to whom, with the Father, all ascriptions of praise may be equally awarded.

"And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; Saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, honor, glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." Rev. v. 11-13.

Again, verse 18, "But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory, both now and for ever. Amen."

"And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him."

Yes, ye seraphs, beings of the upper world, with your hearts of flame; ye, too, may worship him, for it is written, "let all the angels of God worship him."

An angel absolutely refused to receive worship.

"And I John saw these things, and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which shewed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God." Rev. xxii. 8, 9.

In an attempted reply to my former argument

on this text, Mr. May assumed that it was Christ who refused to be worshipped. This confounds the person of Christ with that of an angel. But hear what is said in verse 16.

"I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star."

I now offer my fifth direct argument.

V. Christ claimed and had ascribed to him absolute equality with the Father.

"But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God." John v. 17-19.

Now the Jews understood him to claim that he was equal with God. Jesus knew they so understood him, but he did not deny or disclaim it.

"Then answered Jesus and said unto them Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel. For the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which hath sent him. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John v. 17-23, 26.

"Philip saith unto him, Lord shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?" John xiv. 8-10.

"And all mine are thine, and thine are mine; and I am glorified in God. John xvii. 10.

'But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.' 1st Cor. viii. 6.

You will recollect how my opponent pressed the argument as unanswerable, that Christ was not God, because it was only said "by him

were all things made," instead of "he made all things."

Mr. May remarked—No, I only rely on it to prove that his power was delegated; that he was an agent and not the author of creation.

Mr. Lee answered—Where is the difference, pray, between what you admit and what I state? Nor does it make any difference with the argument. But I ask your attention to these prepositions "by," and "with." They are so used as to place Jesus Christ and God the Father equally in the position of the author and upholder of all things. It is declared all things are "of" God, and all things are "by" Christ.

We are in God, and we are by Christ.

The prepositions here used place Christ in precisely the same relation to all things that they do the father.

Again, in Phil. ii. 6, "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

"For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head bodily." Col. ii. 9.

Now, no created being would dare think of being equal with God. Yet Jesus Christ thought it not robbery to be equal with God. It was, peradventure, for a less ambitious aspiration, that Satan was doomed to infamy, and fell like lightning from the battlements of heaven down deep to hell.

My friend has quoted Greek to you quite slippantly. Now, if you will consult any Greek critic, you will find that the word rendered Godhead is "*Theotees*." This word properly signifies Divine nature. So that the fullness of the Godhead means the fullness of the Divine nature. And if in Christ the fullness of the Divine nature dwelt, surely He was equal with God.

I now offer you my last argument on this part of the question in discussion.

VI. Christianity, as a saving system, proceeds upon the assumption that Christ possesses supreme divinity, power and authority.

The gospel proceeds to offer eternal life to sinners, upon the assumption that Christ suffered and died as the sinners' substitute, to make satisfaction for sin, to be the sinners' propitiation, so that sinners may receive pardon through faith in him, and receive the gift of eternal life, which they could not have had without such death.

As this point is usually denied by Unitarians, I am bound to prove it unless it be admitted.

No mere human or created being could make satisfaction for sin.

There must be something engaged on which law had no prior claim. Thus the whole gospel depends on the divinity as well as humanity of Christ. Unitarians have felt this difficulty so forcibly, that they have generally denied the doctrine of Christ's sacrificial death, as an expiation for the sins of men. This abandoned, the doctrine of pardon must be also abandoned, and all the associate doctrines of grace.

On this point I shall sum up briefly. Those who take away the divinity of Jesus Christ take away our hope of salvation. If I have any hope of heaven there is no other ground on which it rests than that I have laid before you in these arguments for the Divinity of my Lord. If that is lost, all is lost. Without him there is no salvation; no pardon; no rest for the soul; no satisfaction for sin; we have no claim to heaven. But Jesus Christ has become a surety for us. He is the propitiation for our sin. His name, to a lost world, is above every other name. There is no other by which we must be saved. And again I repeat, that if you take away his divinity we have no Saviour. Yes, and every humble believer, every trembling penitent may well exclaim, in accents of grief, to my brother May and those who agree with him, in the language of weeping Mary, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where ye have laid him."

MR. MAY'S SECOND SPEECH.

Leaving my replies to certain incidental matters, which Mr. Lee has brought into his last speech, until I can more properly introduce them in other connections, I will now follow him in the examination of the texts he has just been pressing upon you in support of his main position.

He insists that the works which Christ did, prove him to have been the Almighty. He alleges that he was the Creator of all things, of the worlds' and all things on earth and in heaven. In support of this he quotes John i. 1-3. "The Word was God. * * * All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made."

I answer, if the Word here means, as I believe it does, the Wisdom of God, I have no dispute with Mr. Lee on this point, for I, too, believe that all things were made by the wisdom of God. It was by his wisdom that he

devised, and in wisdom that he executed the work of creation. In all things his wisdom is as conspicuous as his power or goodness.

But if "the Word," here means Jesus Christ then I beg you and this audience to observe, that the language used would lead naturally to the inference that the son of God was the agent of the Creator, that he received from him the directions, and was invested by him with the power to do all that he did. Observe the language, "All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made."

The same appears in the next text which Mr. Lee quoted, Heb. i. 2, "God who, at sundry times and in diverse manners, spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets; hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds."

Here the language is similar and implies the same thing, that the Son was the agent of God in making the worlds, and therefore, of course, inferior and accountable. In the 9th verse, as I have shown on a former evening, this inferiority is very plainly implied, "therefore God, even thy God, *hath anointed thee* with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."

Whether, in the 10th verse, the God who anointed, or the God who was anointed, i. e. the supreme, or the subordinate God, be referred to, I cannot decide for others, but to my mind it is plain enough that the 10th, 11th and 12th verses are a quotation from Psalms cii. 25, 27, suggested by the Apostle's allusion to the creation of the world, and is referable to the Supreme God. Then' in the 13th verse comes a plain intimation that this God of Gods hath shown distinguished favor to the Son, above all angels, ministers or agents of his will

Mr. Lee next quoted Col. i. 16, 17, "By him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him."

Here again, sir, the same form of expression recurs. "By him were all things created." Very different in force is this from the style in which Moses speaks of the Creator and his work. "In the beginning God created the hea-

vens and the earth." Now, sir, this is not a mere hypercriticism upon style. There is a difference in the meaning, a momentous difference in the meaning of the two statements. It appears, as I have shown, more plainly in Hebrews, i. 2, than here. There it reads, "By whom he (God) hath made the worlds." The same is declared even more explicitly, in Ephesians iii. 9, "make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ."

If the Apostle believed and intended to teach, that the man Christ Jesus was the original Creator of all things, of earth and heaven, it is very unaccountable that he should have uniformly used a form of expression which implies that he might have created all things ■ the agent of another. I must therefore believe that this is the sense in which the Apostle meant to be understood.

Now, Mr. chairman, that an inferior being or Aeon, was the agent of the Creator in making the world and establishing the Jewish economy, was believed by the Gnostics. And the Arians believed that Jesus Christ was a pre-existent, super-angelic being, who, under God, was the immediate Creator of all things in the universe, and that God appointed him to do all that needed to be done for the redemption of mankind. You see, therefore, sir, there is nothing declared in either of these passages which Mr. Lee may not believe in common with the Gnostics and Arians.

But, sir, as I do not believe the Apostle intended we should understand him to teach that Jesus Christ was, even as an agent of God, the Creator of the material universe; I must at the risk of being a little tedious, go much more fully than I have done, or can do to-night, into an exposition of his true meaning; which you will find to be much more probable, and much more consistent with all else that is said in the Scriptures respecting Christ. But it will take so much time to do this matter justice, that I must defer it until our next meeting, and now turn me to the argument in behalf of the Deity of Jesus drawn from the facts which Mr. Lee alleges go to show that he *was worshipped*.

If my friend will consult the Greek Testament, he will find five words used, in different

places, to express the ideas we attach to the English word worship. These are, 1, proskuneo; 2, liturgeo; 3, latreuo; 4, sebomai; 5, proseuchomai.

The first of these, "proskuneo," is used to express that respect which one man may show another man as his superior, his king, his ruler, or one on whom he is dependent for some great favor, which he hopes to receive. In the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, and in the Greek original of the New Testament, this word, "proskuneo," is used in the following passages :

Gen. xxiii. 7, 12, where Abraham is said to have bowed down himself to the people of the land, the children of Heth, from whom he wished to obtain a place to bury Sarah.

The same word is used 1st Chron. xxix. 20, where we read that "all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads and worshipped the Lord and the king."

The same word again is found in Daniel ii. 46, thus : "Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face and worshipped Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odors unto him."

In turning to the New Testament my friend will find that it is this word "proskuneo," that is used wherever there is anything said of the worship paid to Jesus. Matt. viii. 2, "And behold there came a leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean."

John ix. 38, the man that had been cured of blindness said to Jesus, "Lord, I believe," and worshipped him.

And in Heb. i. 6, where we read, "let all the angels of God worship him," i. e. the first-begotten.

Now that the word "proskuneo" is not used in the New Testament in any higher sense than in the Old, we learn from the following passages in Luke xiv. 10, Jesus had been instructing his disciples how they should conduct themselves when bidden to a feast, and he adds, "then shalt thou have worship in the presence of those who sit at meat with thee."

Matt. xviii. 26, where the servant in the parable, who owed his Lord ten thousand talents, "fell down and worshipped him."

So in Acts x. 25, "as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet and worshipped him."

In Rev. iii. 9, an assurance is given to the angel, or minister of the Church of Philadelphia, that the disobedient members of the Church shall "worship before thy feet and know that I have loved thee."

Now, let my opponent, or any other advocate of the worship of Jesus, show, if he can, in what single instance either of those other words used to express the honor due to God alone, is applied to Christ, and then he will have at least some shadow of evidence for his doctrine, but at present he has none.

In all the cases I have adduced, the word "proschuneo" is used. Even after Christ's resurrection from the dead, (Matt. xxviii. 9th v.) when "his disciples came and held him by the feet and worshipped him," and also in the 17th verse, the word that is used is "proschuneo."

Upon this passage Dr. Adam Clarke, (whom I love to quote, because I suppose what he says will have much weight with my brother,) remarks as follows :

"This kind of reverence is in daily use among the Hindoos; when a disciple meets a public guide in the streets, he prostrates himself before him, and, taking the dust from his teacher's feet, rubs it on his forehead, breast," &c.

And so, too, Dr. John Pye Smith, a very orthodox gentleman, says :

"The prostrate position, which denoted the highest reverence and respect, is manifestly described, but the expression does not necessarily import more than the most exalted civil homage."

He has adduced those ascriptions of honor and power to Jesus, which occur in the book of Revelations; but they do not prove the Divinity of our Saviour, nor authorize the worship of him as God. For, to say nothing of the doubt that is thrown over the authorship and authority of this book of Revelations, by Dr. Adam Clarke, Dr. Lardner, Michaelis, and others, and the difficulties that beset the interpretation of this exceedingly enigmatical book, there is enough in the book itself to sustain me in my position against the worship of Christ, insisted on by my brother Lee. In this very book of Revelations, whether authentic or not,

we find Jesus represented as rejecting and disavowing all such worship as my friend would have us pay him. I need only refer you to chapters 19 and 20. Michaelis, a Trinitarian commentator of great distinction, says, "The true and eternal Godhead of Christ is certainly not taught in the Apocalypse so clearly as in St. John's gospel, though the author speaks in enthusiastic language of the greatness of Christ's ministry, and the glory communicated to his human nature. At the very beginning of the book, Christ is placed after the seven spirits, who stand near the throne of God; nor is he ever called God, or the Creator of the world, throughout the whole work."—Introduction to New Testament, Vol. IV., page 538.

My brother has referred us to the conduct of the leper, one of the nine who were suddenly healed of that horrible disease, and alone returned with a heart overflowing with gratitude to God, the author, and Jesus as the instrument, by whom his restoration to health had been effected. Read the whole passage for yourself.

Mr. Chairman, and you will see that the construction by no means requires, that we should understand that Jesus is there identified with God. Surely, if the congregation of Israel (1 Chron. xxix. 20,) might without idolatry "bow down their heads and worship the Lord and king David" at the same time—much more might this poor Samaritan, whose joy at his deliverance from the leprosy was unspeakable, fall down at the feet of Jesus, and bless him as the *agent*, while he was giving thanks to God ■■■ the author of his marvellous cure.

Mr. Chairman, as it respects worship, in its highest religious sense, and the being to whom alone that is due, we have the command of Jesus himself; Matt. iv. 10. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Here the word translated "serve," is "latreuo," which, whenever it occurs, means religious worship, AND IS IN NO CASE APPLIED TO JESUS.

But his own words are so much to the point that I refer you to them. In his instruction to his disciples our Lord says:—"In that day ye shall ask me nothing," but they were assured that "whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name he will give it to you.

Now sir, the application which my friend

5

makes of the texts he quotes, seems to me to be incomprehensible. He makes the names of the Father and the Son to be interchangeable, and then quotes some texts as applicable to the Son, and some of them as applicable to the Father, which to my apprehension makes confusion worse confounded.

Mr. Lee quoted the declaration of the Saviour to the Jews that "my Father worketh hitherto and I work" &c. John v. 17-30. He said that the Saviour did not contradict the notion of the Jews, that he had made himself equal with God. But did he not say "The Son can do nothing of himself." He declared that all men should honor the Son as they honor the Father, and he that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father which hath sent him. Yet note the expression "hath sent him." He was the "Servant" the Ambassador of the Father. To honor him in that relation was to honor the Father that sent him. While to refuse to honor him, was to dishonor the Father whose ambassador he was.

And whatever declarations are found ascribing power and attributes divine to Christ, they are to be understood and explained in the light of the passage which say that these are "given" to him by the Father. And I ask if it is not a gross perversion of the Scriptures to declare that the relation of the Son to the Father is the same as the relation of the Father to the Son. Do you not see that we should all be startled at the perversion of the truth, if one should read "the Son is greater than the Father," and "the Father said all power is given to me by my Son"—and yet Sir, if Mr. Lee's doctrine be true, I see not why this interchange might not be made.

Mr. Lee quoted the passage John xvii. 4, "And now O Father glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory that I had with thee before the world was." But he omitted to quote the 21st verse, where Christ prayed that all his disciples, and those who should believe on him through their word, might be one "as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." Our Lord then proceeds to the close of the chapter to explain the relation which he sustained to the Father, and to declare his knowledge of the Father. And in the last verse he uses these remarkable

words, " I have declared unto them thy name and will declare it, that the love wherewith thou hast loved me, may be in them and I in them." This Mr. Chairman is the great Christian doctrine of reconciliation, at-one-ment—which differs much from the doctrine of Atonement, to which my brother has referred. The one, the atonement, is the reconciliation of God to man, by paying price for man's redemption; the other, the at-one-ment—is the reconciliation of man to God by repentance and new obedience. Let me refer you Sir to 2 Peter i. 3, 4, but more especially to the 2d chapter of the Epistle to Titus—11 and 14 verses inclusive, where the Apostle Paul has laid this whole matter so plainly before us in these very plain words :

" The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, Teaching us, that denying ungodliness, and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ : Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

I shall Sir, on a future evening, give my views more fully of the exceeding importance of the death of Christ, in its relation to the salvation of man. And shall exhibit our Heavenly Father, in a very different light from that in which he is presented to us, in the creeds of the prominent orthodox churches of our day. I shall show him to be like the Father in our Saviour's parable of the Prodigal Son, more willing to hear than we are to pray—more willing to forgive our sins than we are to seek forgiveness; and that he welcomes, as a benignant parent, the first symptoms of repentance in his rebellious child; and while he is yet a great way off meets him with expressions of encouragement and love. There is nothing in God or his system of government, that is a barrier to the return of the sinner, nothing but the requirement that the repentance shall be sincere.

FIFTH EVENING—MARCH 9.

MR. LEE'S FIRST SPEECH.

The sense of responsibility which I expressed in my opening address, has in no degree

been diminished by the progress of the discussion. I have no doubt the developments of Tuesday evening last, gave many to see that the issue involves wider extremes than had been supposed could be found between the views of any two professed ministers of Jesus Christ in Syracuse.

In the hour of calm, the bosom of the water is smooth and clear, nor would the untaught beholder think what might compose the gathered sediment beneath. But when the storm-king rides in his chariot upon the face of the waters, and sets the billows to rocking, up comes hidden contents and unsightly objects are seen, which those who were wont to drink the surface waters, little thought lay beneath the place where they quaffed.

The doctrine that Christ was the natural Son of Joseph, which falsifies the express reading of the record, with some other strange views, I shall leave for future consideration, that I may get forward with my direct argument. A few things require attention before I proceed.

It is not my purpose to assail any person or persons, lay or clerical outside of this discussion. And in reference to any personal attacks that have been made, I take this occasion to disclaim all responsibility of any such attacks. But to proceed.

Mr. May affirmed that no doctrine is more clearly and positively stated in the Scriptures than the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Whether it be so or not, does not belong to this discussion. I do not so understand the Scriptures, and hence I hold to the inspiration of the Scriptures, without believing in transubstantiation.

But Mr. May believes that this doctrine is more clearly taught than any other doctrine, and yet he does not believe it. The conclusion is irresistible, that he believes nothing because it is taught in the Scriptures.

So on the subject of baptism, he affirms that there is no scriptural warrant for infant Baptism, or any Baptism but by immersion, and yet he baptises infants, and otherwise than by immersion.

Mr. May said you misrepresent me I think. I said there was no explicit statement for any other.

Mr. Lee. Did you say there was explicit statement for that?

Mr. May. I did, but I baptise otherwise.

Mr. Lee. That answers the point.

The conclusion is that he does not regard the Scriptures ■ a standard. He believes just as the Baptists do, and yet he is not ■ Baptist.

But I think otherwise, and differ from my baptist brethren, and yet we agree on the doctrine of the Trinity. Is it not clear then that the Trinity is more clearly stated.

So on the subject of the Christian Sabbath, he denies that there is any Scriptural warrant for keeping the first day of the week as a Sabbath, in the place of the seventh day Sabbath. Well here again we differ. But this does not belong to the argument.

I think I have proved in a tract, which I have written, that we are all bound religiously to observe the first day of the week as a Sabbath, that the change was made by authority. As my friend has probably never seen it, I will present him with a copy, that he may read it at his leisure.

Mr. Lee here gave a copy into his hands.

The only bearing that this whole matter has, is to prove that Mr. May does not believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures, that he does not bow to them as an authoritative standard, by which is to be determined what is true and right in regard to the subjects of which they treat.

But how does this look? He pressed me for explicit texts, for one explicit text, with which he promised to be satisfied; and now he has told you that the doctrine of transubstantiation is declared in a specific text, more so than any other doctrine, and yet he does not believe it. What will specific texts amount to with a man who declares his disbelief in a doctrine which he avows is more explicitly affirmed in the Scriptures than any other doctrine? And for what purpose does such an one demand explicit texts? Judge ye!

The question of the worship of Christ demands a passing remark. In reply to me on this point, he told you that there are several words in the Greek, which are rendered worship. Two of these only come within the

scope of the argument. They are *Latreuo*, and *Proskuneo*.

He told you that the word *proskuneo*, ■ used in those texts which I quoted to prove that worship was rendered to Christ, but that *Latreuo* is the word used where worship is described as rendered to God. This was partly correct and partly incorrect.

1. It is true that the word *Latreuo* is sometimes used to describe worship rendered to God. But worship is not the primary sense of the word. *Latreuo* is derived from *Latis*, a servant, slave, or attendant, hence, *Latreuo* signifies to serve, wait upon, attend. But as a secondary meaning it is used to devote worship.

Mr. May here observed—That is what I said.

Mr. Lee. It is not what you was understood to say.

Mr. May. It is what I said precisely.

2. It is not correct that this is the word used in Matt. iv. 10, to denote worship, ■ Mr. May affirmed, the word thence used is *proskuneo*.

"Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

In this text *proskuneo* is rendered *worship*, and *latreuo* is rendered *serve*. Service is not always worship, hence where both are named *Proskuneo* is employed to denote the worship, and *Lutreuo* to denote the service.

3. It is not true that *Proskuneo*, the word rendered worship in the texts I quoted, is not used to denote the the worship of the true God.

This word occurs 59 times in the New Testament, as follows :

In 26 texts it is used to express the worship of the true God. In 15 texts it is used to express worship rendered to Christ. In 14 texts it is used to denote worship rendered to false objects, as devils, idols, dragons, beasts, &c.

In 10 cases out of the 14, where false worship is meant, the word is found in Revelations, where they are said to have worshipped the Dragon, the beast and his image. This must be the worship due to God, to make it a crime, and hence, the word must be used in these cases to express such worship as God claims.

The fact then is, out of fifty-nine instances of the use of the word, in 26 it denotes the true worship of the true God, and in 14 it is used to express a false worship, which constitutes the antithesis, or counter of true worship.

This uses up 39 instances of the use of the word, in which it is used to express worship rendered to the true God, or worship which is due to God, but is criminally rendered to false Gods.

This leaves but 19 other cases to be disposed of.

In 15 of these remaining cases, the word is used to denote worship rendered to Christ.

This leaves but 4 cases to be disposed of.

In two of the remaining four cases, it is used to denote worship offered to an angel which was refused, as follows :

" And I fell at his feet to worship him. And he said unto me, *See thou do it not : I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus : worship God.*" Rev. xix. 10.

This was not Christ but an angel, as he speaks of Christ in the third person.

It was no doubt the angel mentioned at the opening of the preceding chapter.

" And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power ; and the earth was lightened with his glory." Rev. xviii. 1.

From the description he may have thought it was Christ himself. The other case is chapter xxii.

" And I John saw these things and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which shewed me these things. Then saith he unto me, *See thou do it not : for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book : worship God.*"

In these two cases where worship was offered to angels, true worship is intended, as is proved by the angel's refusal to receive it, and by his enjoining the worship of God. It cannot be pretended that the angel meant anything less than true worship, when he said worship God.

This leaves but the 2 out of 59 instances of the use of the word *proskuneo*, in which it is

used to describe worship rendered, or offered to men.

This is Mr. May's defense. He finds the word used twice with reference to men, out of 59 instances, in 15 of which it describes worship rendered to Christ, and 26 to God. But let us look at these two cases.

" And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up ; I myself also am a man."

This Mr. May quoted, but he quoted only the first part, Peter's refusal to receive the worship, on the ground that he was a man, shows that Mr. May's application of the text was a perversion of the sense. It proves that the word expresses a kind of worship not due to a man, and which a man may not receive.

The only remaining case is Rev. iii. 9. " Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie ; behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee."

This was said to the angel of the Church at Philadelphia.

If it means the true worship of God it predicts their conversion, and declares that they shall worship not the Church, but God, and worship God at their feet, that is, in their presence.

If it means mere prostration, or subjugation, it is all plain. It is a promise that that church should triumph over her enemies. In this case this word is used in its primary sense which is to prostrate ones self. It is hence used to express worship because that was the form usually practiced in the east.

To close this review of my friend's learned criticism, let me say, that *Latreuo*, which he says is the word used in Greek to express the true worship of God, occurs 21 times in the New Testament, out of which it is translated worship only four times, and in the remaining 17 it is translated serve.

The word *proskuneo*, which he says is not used to express the worship of God, is found 59 times in the New Testament, and is translated worship in every single instance, and in 26 it denotes the worship of God, and in 15, worship rendered to Christ. In all other cases

save one, it denotes worship due to God, which was tendered to, or wickedly rendered to other beings, and in the one remaining case it is used to denote the submission which the enemies of the church was to render to her, under the hand and power of God.

How terribly pushed must ■ cause be to have occasion to resort to such criticisms as the one I have now exposed. You know as well as I that nothing but desperation would drive any disputant upon such baseless grounds, of defense.

I now resume the direct argument in the affirmative of the main question.

Trinitarians affirm that Christ, the Saviour, was both God and man, that he possessed absolute Divinity and entire humanity, and that the two natures constitute the one Christ.

This is the only ground upon which the Scriptures can be reconciled with themselves.

One class of Scriptures affirm that he is God, from everlasting, eternal," the same yesterday to-day and forever."

Another class of Scriptures present him as ■ child born ; the son of Mary ; a man, suffering and dying, and rising again. These classes of Scripture cannot both be true of the same nature, but the one class is true of his Divine nature, and the other class is true of his human nature.

I propose at this point to prove the fact of the Two Natures of Christ. This is the key to what would otherwise be mystery.

I. That Christ possessed two natures is proved by ■ comparison of those two classes of texts, one of which affirms his Godhead, and the other of which affirms, his humanity.

The first point, namely, that he possessed a divine nature, has been proved and the arguments need not be repeated. [See Argument for the undivided Divinity of Christ.]

That Christ possessed human nature may be soon proved.

This indeed has been admitted by my opponent. And if I was arguing merely for the purpose of convincing my friend, the argument might rest here upon his admission. But I ■ arguing with ■ view to establish the truth in the minds of my hearers, and I cannot pass by any essential point without establishing it by direct testimony.

1. He was the Son of Mary.

"She brought forth her first-born Son." Luke ii. 7.

"There was a marriage in Canaan of Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there." John ii. 1.

2. He was the seed of Abraham. As such he was promised to the world.

"And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed ; because thou hast obeyed my voice." Gen. xxii. 18.

"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many ; but ■ of one, And to thy seed which is Christ." Gal. iii. 16.

If Christ did not possess humanity, he did not correspond to the person promised.

3. Christ was the Son of David.

"What think ye of Christ ? whose Son is he ? They say unto him, the Son of David." Matt. xxii. 42.

"And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David ! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord ; Hosanna in the highest !" Matt. xxi. 9.

"And when Jesus departed thence, two blind men followed him, crying, and saying, Thou Son of David, have mercy on us." Matt. ix. 27.

"Concerning his son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh ;" Rom. i. 3.

4. He is declared to be a man.

"For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus ;" 1. Tim. ii. 5.

"For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honor than the house." Heb. iii. 3.

"But this man, because he continueth ever hath an unchangeable priesthood." Heb. vii. 24.

"For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices : wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer." Heb. viii. 3.

"But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God ;" Heb. x. 12.

Here are five texts which call him a man, and more might be adduced.

5. Christ exhibited all the usual phenomena of human nature.

He was born a child, and grew to be a man.

He was hungry and thirsty, and eat and drank.

He grew weary and rested.

He slept and awoke.

He rejoiced, and was sorrowful and wept.

He lived and he died.

The proofs of the two points are now before us, that he was God, and that he was man.

The only conclusion is that he was God and man.

This harmonizes the book of Revelation completely. But if the twofold nature of Christ be denied, then is the Bible placed at war with itself, as indeed it seems to be the aim of my opponent so to represent it.

MR. MAY'S FIRST SPEECH.

There are a few incidental matters suggested by what has just been said which I will dispose of as briefly as possible.

Mr. Lee alluded to my attack, last evening, upon certain individuals. What I said, sir will be published; and when those individuals themselves shall see what I said, and remember what they have said and published respecting me and my supposed opinions, I cannot believe they will deem me severe, or that my remarks were impertinent to the point I was pressing on your notice.

In the next place, Mr. Lee took no little pains to make me appear to you as an enemy to the Bible. I cannot conceive what ground he has for such a representation, unless it be, that my principles and modes of biblical interpretation differ from his. They will both be before this audience in the published report of this discussion; and they may judge for themselves which is the better of the two, when they have become students of the Scriptures.

Mr. Lee then misrepresented (I am willing to believe unintentionally,) the use I made of the doctrines of Transubstantiation, Baptism, and the Sabbath. I alluded to them, sir, only as examples of the use the Protestant world has made of that principle of interpretation which we are condemned for applying to other subjects. Though I cannot deny that the literal

teaching of the Bible, on each of the above-named doctrines, is in their favor, yet, sir, I think the general Protestant belief respecting them is more in accordance with the spirit of the Bible, and all I ask is to be allowed to apply the same principle to the interpretation of the Scriptures on other doctrines.

In my friend's remarks upon the subject of the worship of Christ, he led you to suppose that I introduced only two words, "proskuneo" and "latrueo." But, sir, here is the manuscript from which I read, and here are five words, which you will see in the published report. Now, I did not deny that proskuneo, which is often used to express civil or personal respect to a fellow man, is sometimes used when speaking of the worship of God. Nay, I quoted several passages in which the word is used in reference to the worship of God as well as man. I denied, sir, and I deny again, that the words which mean the worship due to God alone are used in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, or in the Greek original of the New, when the worship of Christ is spoken of.

We now come, sir, to the exposition I promised last night to give of the passages quoted by my brother, to prove that Christ was the Creator of the *material universe*, passages which I shall attempt to show mean the *new creation*, the regeneration of mankind. I can hardly expect that my exposition will be at once accepted by those who have been educated to read these Scriptures differently. Let me bespeak a careful attention now, and hereafter, when it shall appear from the press, a due examination in the light of the Scriptures themselves.

Mr. Lee argued that Jesus Christ is the Almighty God, because he is said to have been the Creator of all things—the maker of the world. In support of this he quoted John i. 1-3, "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made." Ephesians, iii. 9, "And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." Colos. i. 15-18, "Who is the image of the in-

visible God, the first-born of every creature : for by him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible ; whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers ; all things were created by him and for him ; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body—the church : who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead ; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell."

Hebrews i. 1, 2, and 10-12, "God, who at sundry times and in diverse manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds. * * * And thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth : and the heavens are the works of thine hands : They shall perish ; but thou remainest : and they shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed : but thou art the same and thy years fail not."

I immediately replied, in part, to his argument, as you will remember, by showing that in neither of these places is it said, that the Son of God, or Christ, or the Word, created all things, or made the world ; but that "by him God made the world," "by him all things were created." If I were an Arian I should leave my reply as it was left, on this point, last Tuesday evening. Please recur to it. But as I do not believe the writers of the New Testament, in the above quoted passages, if we except, perhaps, John i. 1, referred to the first—the material creation—but to the new, the moral, the spiritual creation or re-creation, I shall now proceed, sir, to develope what seems to me to be the Scriptural doctrine upon this point.

1. The Gospel is distinctly foretold by the prophets of the Old Testament as a *new creation*. Isaiah lxv. 17, "Behold I create new heavens and a new earth, and the former shall not be remembered, or come into mind."

Isaiah lxvi. 22, "For as the new heavens and the new earth which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain." See also Isaiah li. 16.

Much other language of the prophets seems to imply the same. In the book of Revelation the church or kingdom of Christ is called the New Jerusalem. John says, chap. xxi. 1, "I saw a new heaven and a new earth." 2, "I John, saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven." 5th verse, "And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new."

The Greek word, *ektisthe*, rendered created may, with the same propriety be rendered, were *renewed* or *re-created*.

To increase my confidence that this is the true meaning of the words I am considering, the Apostle Paul, who is the best commentator on his own words, expressly styles the gospel dispensation a new creation.

Gal. vi. 15, "For in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature," which Dr. Adam Clarke, and others of the best critics, say should be rendered "a new creation."

2d Cor. v. 17, "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creation ; old things are past away, behold all things are become new."

Eph. i. 10 to 22, "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." All who are familiar with the New Testament, know I could quote much more to the same effect.

En arke, translated "in the beginning," does not certainly mean in the commencement of the work of creation described by Moses in Genesies. In Luke i. 2, and Mark i. 1, the same phrase in the original and in the translation, obviously means the commencement of Christ's life. So in John's Epistles, and in those of the other Apostles, this phrase is often used in this sense. It may refer either to the beginning of the first or of the second creation.

Aionas, translated worlds in Hebrews i. 2; *aiionon*, translated world in Eph. iii. 9, ought not to be understood of the material world ; because elsewhere the word *aiion*, in the New Testament, whether in the singular or plural, never signifies the material world. The connection in which it occurs, in the various instances in which it is used, shows this.

In one of the texts quoted by Mr. Lee, Heb. i. 2, a son is declared to be the person by whom the world's were made. In the 10th 11th and

12th verses of this chapter, the God of this Son is addressed as the Creator of the heavens and the earth. And both Jesus and his Apostles elsewhere teach that God the Father created the visible world, and distinguish him as the Creator, from Jesus Christ. See Acts iv. 24, 27, 30; xvii. 24, 28, 31; Luke x. 21; Matt. vi. 30; xix. 4. These are enough, though any number might be adduced.

If we interpret *aion* to mean the material world, we shall find it will not suit the context. Both the immediately preceding and following passages, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, generally treat, not of the original creation, but of the age of the Messiah. The Epistle commences by saying that "God, who at sundry times and in diverse maners spake to the fathers by the prophets, hath, in these *last days*, (or in this age,) spoken unto us by his Son." And Christ is declared, in various places, to be the Mediator of the new covenant and superior to Moses, which implied that he was not the Mediator of the old covenant. On the contrary, the Jewish and Christian Scriptures unite in representing the Messiah as appointed by God to introduce and conduct a spiritual kingdom.

John i. 17, "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Compare this with Col. i. 12, 23.

From all these considerations, and many more which need not be mentioned now, I am led to the conclusion that the word translated "worlds" in Heb. i. 2, and "world" in Eph. iii. 9, ought to have been translated *age*—meaning the age of the Messiah. This signification is evidently pointed out in the first clause of the verse; and it corresponds with the succeeding verses, which particularly point to the gospel dispensation. It also coincides with the general subject of the Epistle. I am therefore persuaded that the true translation would be, "by whom also he instituted or introduced this age."

"*The first-born of every creature*," is a Hebrew idiom, or a Jewish form of speaking, of the use of which we have several instances in the Old Testament. In one sense it signifies the same as the only begotten, that is to say the best beloved, the peculiar favorite, one who is preferred to all others. Thus Israel and Ephraim are called the first-born of God. Exod. iv. 22, "Thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, thus saith

Jehovah, Israel is my son, even *my first-born*." Jeremiah xxxi. 9, "I am a Father to Israel, and Ephraim is *my first-born*." In Psalms lxxxix. 27, David has the title of first-born conferred upon him. "He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. Also I will make him, *my first-born*, higher than the kings of the earth."

But there is a passage still more to my purpose. Rom. viii. 29, "for whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate, to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he (his Son) might be the *first-born among many brethren*." Here our Lord is plainly styled the first-born among many brethren, as being the head or author of the Christian dispensation. This may help to explain the Apostle's words, and, taken in connection with the acknowledged sense in which the word *first-born* is used in the Old Testament, is sufficient to confirm my interpretation. Christ is called the first-born of every creature, not because he was the first being whom God ever made, but because he was the head, the author of the new creation, the regeneration of the moral world. I know it is said, Eph. iii. 17, "that he is before all things, and by him all things consist." But, if what has already been said be true, we need not understand this to mean before all things with respect to time, but dignity, excellence, holiness, and the favor of God. He is more excellent than all former prophets or law-givers; acts in a higher sphere, and more exalted capacity than any of them ever did. The all things which consist in him, or are established by him, are obviously the things of the *new creation*, which Paul, in a previous passage, tells us are from old things which are passed away, having been brought by Christ into a reformed or regenerated state.

I am further strengthened in my conviction that by the phrase "all things," is not meant the things of the material world, by the language which is used in the verse immediately preceding the 16th, "By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or principalities, or powers."

It seems to me very obvious that by "all things," can be meant only such things as needed to be, and might be regenerated, and reconciled to God.

A similar use of a general term is found in the next chapter, where it is said of the gospel "that it was preached to every creature under heaven," meaning, of course, only such creatures as were adapted to receive the gospel, i. e. rational and moral beings, not the lower orders of creatures. In both cases we are required to limit the application of the language used. Thrones, dominions, and principalities, are words designating particular things, and therefore of those particular things we must suppose the Apostle to be speaking in the text, and not of all things universally. What, then, is the import of these words? They manifestly denote "those who sit on thrones," those who exercise dominion. Thus civil rulers are denominated by the same Apostle, Titus iii. 1, "principalities and powers." Paul exhorts the Ephesians to put on the whole armor of God, and adds, "for we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Of Christ it is said in another Epistle, "having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them, openly triumphing over them."

And again, the same Apostle declares to the Romans, "I am persuaded that neither life nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, shall be able to separate us from the love of God." These are examples of the use of these terms in the New Testament. More might be adduced if it were necessary.

To ascertain what sense to attach to them in this passage Col. i. 16, 17, we must examine the preceding verses. Paul has just spoken of Christians as delivered from the power of darkness and "translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son." It is to power, authority and pre-eminence in that kingdom, that the word thrones probably relate. The creation intended is not the natural creation, but a moral spiritual one—that, effected by the Christian dispensation. The whole passage seems to me designed to declare the supremacy of Christ, in that kingdom of which he is the founder and head. However eminent the subjects of his kingdom, they are subjects still—"those who sit on thrones, those who exercise dominion, those who administer government, and those who have power" are bound, just as much as

private individuals, to be obedient to Christ, and they must answer for their disobedience. Would to God, the rulers of our country, the members of our national Congress especially, realized this. They and we must suffer until they do. For Christ is the first born of the new creation—to him all things in the Christian world owe their origin, "all were created through him and for him," and "he is before all" first in dignity, office and character; and by him all consist; that is, are supported and kept in being in spiritual life through their relation to him—as the branches are preserved and invigorated by the juice of the vine, to use Christ's own beautiful figure. And he is the head of the Church—the first born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence, for it pleased the Father, that in him should all fullness dwell.

The same general sentiment is expressed in the second chapter." "Ye are complete in him, who is the *head* of all principality and power." We find it also in the first chapter to the Ephesians—"When he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body—the fulness of him that filleth all things."

If you ask me Sir, for further authority for considering the creation spoken of in the texts upon which I have been commenting—a *moral creation*. I will give you yet more. This very apostle Paul styles the change effected by Christianity a new creation. He tells Christians that they are God's workmanship, *created* in or through Christ Jesus unto good works." Eph. i. 10. A similar use of language is not uncommon in the Old Testament. "I create Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy." "I have put my words in thy mouth, and have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion thou art my people." Drop down ye heavens from above, and let the skies pour down righteousness; let the earth open, and let them bring forth salvation, let righteousness spring up to-

gether, I the Lord have created it." These passages relate you remember, to the restoration of the Jews to a happier civil and moral state. I surely do not depart from Scripture analogy, in the interpretations I have proposed of the term "*create*," as applied with signal propriety to that recovery, which restored spiritual life and immortal hope to a world dead in trespasses and sins.

My time is out, else I would give you paraphrases of the above passages, made in accordance with my belief that they relate to the *new creation*.

LEE'S SECOND SPEECH.

I shall not attempt to examine the superstructure of my friend until it is completed. It will be time enough then for me to adopt, or attempt to demolish his "*new creation*."

Mr. May—I have said all I intend on that.

Mr. Lee—I will now resume the argument that I commenced in my former remarks this evening. And at this point it may be observed that the argument gains strength at every step. Like the progress of a river, the argument deepens and widens as it flows, by receiving at every step the tributary strength of smaller streams. So the previous arguments I have offered hold their own strength and are increased by each successive proposition that I establish. The next point to be considered is this.

II. The two-fold nature of Christ is proved by the fact of his pre-existence.

Of course his pre-existence has been proved, while proving his divine nature, but I will now prove the point by another class of texts.

"What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" John vi. 62.

What does that mean?

"Before," means before he came into the world, before his incarnation.

He was then in heaven with the Father.

"I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world, again, I leave the world, and go to the Father." John xvi. 28.

This asserts that he existed with the Father before he came into the world, as plainly as it teaches that he exists with the Father now he has left the world.

"For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the

world. Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." John vi. 33-35.

This asserts that he came down from heaven.

"Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad. Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am." viii. 56-58.

If our Saviour did not mean to assert that he existed before, and at the time that Abraham existed, he deceived the Jews, for they so understood him, and he knew it.

He used this language in the memorable prayer he offered up before his passion. "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." John xvii. 5.

This proves that Christ possessed glory with the Father before the world was.

The fact is now proved that Christ did exist before he was born of Mary.

He had a pre-existing nature, which was not human nature. But as the Son of Mary he was human.

His pre-existing nature joined to the human nature which he derived from his mother Mary, make two natures.

We must either deny his pre-existence, or deny his humanity, or admit that he possessed two natures.

III. The twofold nature of Christ is proved by a class of texts, which so clearly imply that he was both God and man, that they can be true upon no other principle. Take for instance if you please this passage.

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Isa. ix. 6.

It cannot be maintained that this is all true of any one nature."

It cannot all be true of a being wholly Divine because he could never have been a child. It cannot be all true of a human being because he could not be called "The mighty God"—

nor could it be true of an angel for no angel was ever "child born."

But Mr. May remarked upon this text, that it was only said he should "*be called*" the Mighty God, not that he *was* the Mighty God.

The reply is he was so called by inspiration. So called by divine appointment.

Again it is said, Matt. i. 23. "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel; which being interpreted, is, God with us."

"God with us"—God and man. "God with us"—God united to us, clothed in our nature.

"If David then called him Lord, how is he his Son?" Matt. xxii. 45.

Now here is a question asked by our Lord which no one in heaven nor on the earth can answer if Jesus was not possessed of two natures—"If David then call him Lord how is he his Son?"

This question can be answered only by admitting the two natures of Christ.

It is said—"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." John i. 1, 14.

You will remember with what an effort of labored criticism Mr. May dwelt on these passages denying their application to Jesus Christ and affirming that it meant an Aeon or something else.

Mr. May spoke at once. I said it was written to disprove the doctrine of the Gnostics that an Aeon and not God made the world.

Mr. Lee—you said it meant Wisdom.

Mr. May—I said the word might be rendered Wisdom or Reason.

Mr. Lee—I have no occasion now to go into any repetition of Mr. May's former argument, denying that "the word" meant Christ because he has now swallowed his words. Now he makes it mean Jesus Christ in order to make out his new creation.

Mr. May—I said Christ was referred to in the 14th verse.

It is said in 1 Tim. iii. 16. "And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

This can be explained only on the ground of his two natures.

"Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:" Phil. ii. 6. 7.

"He took" on him the form of a servant,—Was made &c. That form was humanity. He was, before he took it. That added to what he was, made two natures.

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." Heb. ii. 14, 16.

He "took part" of the same, supposes it to have been added to what he was.

He took the seed of Abraham &c. He could not act before he existed. Nor could this be said of you or I: or any other only human being.

"I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star."

The "root" and "offspring" implies the two natures.

"The root" is that on which David grew; his Creator. The "offspring" is that which grew on David; his son. This is clear. And no other exposition can be or has been given to it.

IV. The office and work of Christ required that he should combine a divine and human nature in one person.

The necessity of an atonement I am prepared to defend the moment it is explicitly denied. For the present it is assumed.

The work of making an atonement for the sins of men required it.

1. No mere human being could atone for sin.

If Christ was a mere human being, which he must have been if he did not possess two natures, he was under the same law to God that all other human beings are, and could not atone for the sins of other human beings.

In order to an atonement, there must be something engaged on which the law had no claim.

Every created being is bound to devote all his

powers to the Creator, during the entire extent of his rational existence.

But Christ has made an atonement for the sins of men. This I am ready to prove if it be denied.

2. None but a human being could make an atonement for men.

To redeem human nature, right reason says human nature must be the offering.

For this we have the opinion of St. Paul :— “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same ; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.”

Death was the penalty of the law, and the death of the body was one of the consequences involved.

Christ took our nature and died and rose again to redeem us from the power of death.

The fact that he was a human being, our brother, allies us to him, and through him to God. The two natures were necessary to render him a suitable mediator between God and men.

“There is one God and one Mediator between God and men.” 1st Tim. ii. 6.

“Now a Mediator is not a Mediator of one, but God is one.” Gal. iii. 20.

“He ever liveth to make intercession for them.” Heb. vii. 25.

“Christ is entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.” Heb. ix. 24.

Humanity is there, and he represents us in the court of heaven, with one hand on the throne, and the other upon us, his poor kinsmen.

V. The doctrine of the two natures of Christ may be urged from the fact that no other account can be given of his nature and character.

The Scriptures declare him to be God and man, but they pronounce him nothing else.

If he is not God and man what is he?

It will be said that he is the Son of God.

But what is the Son of God? Is he a God? or is he a man? or is he neither?

I press the question, What is he?

If it be said that he was God and not man, then God was once born a child, and grew, and lived, and died.

If it be said that he was a man and not God, then we have only a human Saviour, a human

Redeemer, and a human Intercessor, whose arm is but an arm of flesh.

It is written “Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm.” Jer. xvii. 5.

But of Christ it is said, “Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.” Now put that and that together.

If it be said that he was neither God nor man, what was he? Was he an angel? No, for angels cannot die.

But admit that he was God and man, and all is plain, and we have a Saviour worthy of everlasting trust. One to whom we can commit our souls without distrust or fear of being confounded. Beneath his protection we may rest secure, though the universe be moved. For he upholdeth all things by the word of his power. This is our Saviour—this is our Christ. In him now trust, and shall forever and forevermore.

MR. MAY'S SECOND SPEECH.

By our Saviour's very explicit disclaimers of the divine attributes, which Mr. Lee declares that he possessed, my friend is driven at last to resort, as I foresaw he must, to the doctrine that there were two natures in Jesus Christ—that he was both God and a man. But this seems to me like leaving a ship, which one finds to be sinking, for a boat, to which there is no bottom. If there were ever a sheer device of poor human ingenuity, it is this of the two natures of Christ. It could not have been imposed upon the faith of the church, but in “the dark ages,” when the understandings of men were so perverted, that the excellence of one's belief was measured by the degree of improbability in the proposition, which he professed to believe. Indeed, it is so utterly inconsistent with that equality, which is claimed for the three persons in the Godhead, that I marvel any keen-sighted trinitarian should resort to it; and it is so palpably self-contradictory, that so good a logician as my opponent here should know better than to place any reliance upon it.

Before I proceed to examine the texts, Mr. Lee has alleged in its support, I will unfold this strangest of all doctrines, that you, Sir, and our audience may see for yourselves, that we are bound not to believe that such a monstrosity is an essential ingredient in the theology of the Gospel, unless we can find an explicit declaration of its truth, in the words of Christ or his

Apostles. Nay, Sir, in order to convince us Protestants, the statement of this doctrine should be even more explicit and emphatic, if possible, than the statement of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which we explain as beautifully figurative, because the literal meaning of Christ's words would be hideously absurd. And yet the doctrine of transubstantiation is more possible than this of "the two natures of Christ." So utterly incredible, Mr. Chairman, is this doctrine that we ought to reject such a doctrine as this because of its absurdity, unless indeed, my brother can show us, or we can find, a command from God to adore it as a mystery.

You have heard my brother Lee's statement of this doctrine. Let me now read to you what the Rev. Mr. Ashley and General Granger, who have so freely denounced me as an infidel, profess to believe, as it is stated in the 2d Article of the Creed of their Episcopal Church. "The Son, which is the word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature, in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood were joined together in one person, never to be divided; whereof is one Christ, very God and very man," &c. The statement of this doctrine is very similar in the 2d Article of the VIII Chap. of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, and what Mr. Lee has stated just now is tantamount to it. My brother said to me the other evening in a very dolorous tone, "you have taken away my Lord, and I know not where you have laid him." Pray, let me now ask him what he has done with our Lord Jesus Christ? Sir, he has laid him away in an inextricable labyrinth of words, where neither he nor I can find him.

Let me first show my friend, how this new doctrine subverts the one which he set out in this discussion to prove. He has attempted to maintain that "in the unity of the Godhead there are three persons of one substance, power and eternity." All his arguments hitherto have been intended to prove that the Son (i. e., the second person of this trinity,) possessed in and of himself all the attributes of Deity—all the omnipotence, omniscience, eternity and immutability of God, so that (if his language means what it implies) I think he might have added, if there were no Father, and no Holy Ghost, no first and third persons, the Godhead would yet be "perfect and entire, wanting nothing." And

yet to this second person of his Trinity by the doctrine now before us, he has added something, he has added *perfect manhood*. Now, Sir, if he can establish his original proposition, and prove that there are in the Godhead three persons, each one equal to the whole three, then will he destroy that equality if he succeed in maintaining this doctrine of two natures, because, Sir, where there is a perfect balance, a feather's weight will destroy the equipoise. But according to this doctrine somewhat more than a feather was added to the second person of the Trinity—it was manhood; yes, Sir, perfect manhood—a nature, which according to the Psalmist, was a little lower than the angels! Surely then, if the Son before his incarnation was equal with the Father, after that event, he became his superior to the extent of an almost angelic nature. Brother Lee, where now is there any equality between the three persons of your Godhead?

Nor is this the only inequality, which my brother has at least hinted at. He urged, under the last head of his second speech, on Tuesday evening, that the whole Gospel was based upon the glorious fact that Jesus Christ, the second person of his Trinity, had suffered the punishment due to the sins of mankind—had thus made satisfaction to divine justice, and opened the door through which alone we may escape from the wrath of God and the damnation of Hell. I am not sure that I have used his language precisely, but I have given you his idea, as it came to me. Now I beg to know what stronger contrast could be drawn between two persons than that, which is set before us in this doctrine of the voluntary humiliation, the propitiatory self-sacrifice of the second person, and the inexorable sternness of the first. The one sitting aloof in his ineffable majesty, beyond the reach of the cries and prayers of the penitent, until the second person, "touched with the feeling of our infirmities," came down to earth, "humbled himself as a servant, and became obedient unto death even the death of the cross," that he might save us from eternal woe. With whom now I ask was all the mercy, all the love in the divine Being, in the three-one-God?—with the first person or the second?—with the former who demanded or the latter who paid the price of man's redemption? With equal pertinence might I say to my brother Lee, by this doctrine, you have taken away my *heavenly Father*, and I know not where you have laid him, except it be, under the necessity

of acting the part of an inexorable tyrant. This cannot be the merciful parent described in the 103 Ps. and in Christ's parable of the Prodigal Son.

Again, this doctrine of two natures requires me to believe that Jesus Christ had two minds—a human mind capable of being tempted and of suffering extreme agony, and a divine mind incapable of either. "Three persons in one essence," said Mr. Thorn of Liverpool, "is unintelligible enough"; but before my brother here has quite convinced me that such is the nature of the Godhead, he propounds to my faith this opposite mystery of two natures in one essence. And here I cannot be put off with the metaphysical sophistry he attempted the other evening, when he told me that God's nature of course, was incomprehensible, and we must not expect to find it out to perfection. Under that cloud he tried to make me accept a contradiction as well as a mystery, as I showed him in my reply. But here in this doctrine of the two natures, which he would have me believe is an indispensable part of the other, which cannot be maintained without this, he has given me as the basis of my reasoning, something which I do understand, if I understand any thing; "for who knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of a man which is in him?" In Algebra it is difficult to solve an equation, of which the terms are all unknown quantities. But the moment you get a known quantity into one of the terms, the trouble is over. Upon that you can base a process of reasoning that shall bring out the solution sought after. Just so it is in the case before us. I could not disprove my brother's first proposition respecting three infinite persons perhaps, excepting so far as I could show that the parts of it contradicted each other. But in the one now before me, I discover a quantity that is known to me. One term is a man: and if I know any thing, I know what a man is, at least so far as to perceive that the other parts of this proposition of two natures God and man so united as to be one and the same person cannot be true. If I have any idea of God, it is, that he is an infinite Spirit, who has existed from all eternity, uncreated, unbegotten, undivided, without beginning or end, incapable of change, possessed of all wisdom, all power, all goodness, without a visible body or material members.

My idea of man, if I have any, is that of a finite being, clothed in flesh and blood, who

began to exist a longer or shorter time ago, whose powers are limited, who knows but little compared with what is to be known, and can do but little, by his own unaided strength.

Now is it possible so to compound these ideas as to make of them one and the same idea? What can be plainer to the human mind than that of a finite being cannot be also an infinite being; that a person who could do nothing of himself was not the veritable Creator of the Universe; that a being of limited knowledge cannot know every thing; that a being who commenced his existence (as this complex person, second in the Trinity, certainly did) 1854 years ago, had existed from all eternity; that a person who according to this doctrine at the commencement of the Christian era, incarnated himself and superadded to his deity perfect manhood, is not the being, who has never known the shadow of a change? These questions answer themselves.

But they do not bring us to the end of the contradictions, inconsistencies, impossibilities involved in the doctrine, which Mr. Lee has pressed upon me.

Now Sir, I have another very grave objection to this doctrine, which I wish to submit to your consideration before I examine the slender proofs, on which my opponent is willing to rely for its support. This doctrine of two natures implicates the moral character of our Saviour, impeaches his veracity and attributes to him deceit, equivocation, falsehood. For according to this doctrine, Jesus sometimes spoke and acted in his human, and sometimes in his divine nature, without admonishing his hearers, in which of his natures he was speaking or acting. Thus on more than one occasion he declared that he could of himself do nothing, but if he were God he could at that very moment do all things, and yet he did not tell those who heard him, that he meant that as a man he could do nothing. On another occasion he declared that he knew not the day, nor the hour of judgment. Now according to this doctrine of his two natures, he was ignorant of that great event only as a man, although he knew it perfectly as God, and yet said nothing to guard his hearers from misunderstanding him.

Once more, when he forbade the young ruler to call him good, because "there is none good but one, that is God." If he meant only that goodness should not be ascribed to him as a man, while it should be ascribed to him, in its

highest conceivable measure, as God, why did he not intimate that this was his meaning? And when he forbade his disciples to pray to him, to ask any thing of him, but to ask all things of God in his name, how can it be explained, if he knew himself to be God, that he did not guard his hearers, and those who may now read the narratives of his life, from dangerous error by intimating that he meant no one should worship him or pray to him *as a man*, while, as God, the whole universe should do him homage? If the doctrine of the two natures be true, if Christ was God as well as man, then he was guilty of what in the mildest term we call equivocation. If a King or President should declare that he had no power to pardon an offender, meaning that he had no power to do so as a man, while at the same moment as the supreme ruler, he could set him at liberty by a word, he would equivocate. If Sir Isaac Newton had been asked to tell some earnest inquirers by what forces the planets were held in their orbits, and had replied, he did not know, meaning that he did not know it as a common man, while as the discoverer of the great law of gravitation he understood it very well, all would say that he equivocated, deceived, said what was not true. So if Sir John Herschell should now be interrogated, by persons who wished to know in what year Erke's Comet will appear again, and he should answer that he did not know, meaning all the while, that he did not know that distant day *as a man*, while he did know it, as an astronomer, he would be guilty of deception. No one would ask him or Sir I. Newton such questions as common, unlearned men, but as men who had studied these subjects, and were fairly presumed to know vastly more than those who put to them the inquiries, I have supposed.

And more, if Archimedes the philosopher, of old Syracuse in Sicily, had been applied to, to move a ton's weight, and had answered that he had no power to do it—meaning that by his own unaided physical strength as a man, he had not power enough for such an undertaking—he would justly have been accused of lying, especially by those who had heard him say, in his scientific lectures, that with the power of the lever, if he had a suitable fulcrum and a place to stand on, he could move the world.

Such duplicity—such deception as this, the doctrine we are considering, virtually imputes to Jesus Christ, when his disciples made inqui-

ries of him respecting the day of judgment. They approached him as an uncommon person—as one, who they were persuaded knew more than most men, perhaps more than all men; they appealed to him to tell them on this important subject what he knew more than they did—more than other men knew. If, therefore, in any way, in any character, or in any nature, he was able to answer their question, he deceived them by replying as he did. So likewise in the other cases to which I have referred. If words have any meaning, Jesus Christ expressly disclaimed the possession of any of the attributes of Deity. He disclaimed omnipotence, when he declared "I can of myself do nothing." He disclaimed omniscience when he declared "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, neither the Son, but the Father. He disclaimed supreme and infinite goodness when he said "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one that is good." This is plain language; there is no mystery or obscurity in it. The terms "I," "me," "my own self," as every one knows, always denotes an individual or person; and they include the whole of that person; they comprehend all which goes to constitute him what he is, viewed as an individual or whole. In this sense our Saviour must have used them, or he must have been guilty of manifest prevarication.

Then consider further—no one who witnessed his wonderful works supposed that of his own power, as an ordinary man, he did them; but some suspected that he might be a being of a higher order than human. To that apprehension in his disciples, it was, that he spoke when he disclaimed omnipotence, omniscience, and attributed his power and wisdom to God who gave to him all of either of those attributes, that he had manifested to their admiration.

But again: If there be any part of Christ's example which is more valuable to beings such as we are, in the midst of trials and temptations, it is his confiding and submissive piety. What words nerve so powerfully our resolution to withstand the wrong, as his "get thee behind me Satan," or rather the spirit which they evince? And oh, what words come to us with such a sustaining power, when our hearts are ready to sink under a bitter disappointment, or sore bereavement; what words in the hour of overwhelming affliction, help us to say so exactly what should be said by all dependent beings, and in the very utterance of them awaken

■ faith and ■ submission kindred to that which inspired them. I say what words were ever spoken ■ full of the spirit of filial trust and pious resignation as his, "the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it? Father not my will but thine be done!" But if this doctrine which Mr. Lee affirms be true, it takes away all reality from Christ's acknowledgment of dependence; his supplications for aid, and his expressions of entire acquiescence in the divine will. If he were God, how could he have really suffered, as he appeared to do in the garden of Gethsemane. If in him "the Godhead and manhood were joined together, never to be divided," what are we to make of his cry upon the cross, "my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" If he were the eternal Jehovah, how could his death upon the cross have been anything more than an appearance? His resurrection and assencion too, what evidence would they be of man's immortality? If Christ were God, to whom could he have offered prayer? If he were himself the Highest, Holiest One, to whom could he look up with reverence? If he were the infinite God incarnate, his prayers must have been offered to himself; and thus his devotions become utterly unintelligible; and we are deprived of the strengthening, comforting influence of his example in our days of trial, in our nights of affliction.

In conclusion sir, let me say that the use which this doctrine requires us to make of certain expressions of Scripture, *mystifies the Bible*, and destroys all confidence in the meaning of its language. If for the sake of supporting a system of doctrines, devised centuries after Christ's ascension, we are required to set aside the plain, obvious meaning of Christ's declarations respecting himself, and assume that he meant something very different from what he certainly said. Why, if this be the use we are to make of the Bible, there can no dependence be placed upon its teachings; we had much better go directly to the creeds of the churches, and not trouble ourselves to look for any truth beyond them; or, better still, go back again into the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church, which boldly assumes and frankly tells us that we cannot be trusted to read the word of God for ourselves; but that the true interpretation of the Bible is committed to the Church; nay, more, that certain doctrines of higher significance than those which are recorded in Scripture, have been transmitted in the unwritten word of Apostolic tradition; and can be learnt

only through the teaching, and on the authority of the consecrated ministers of the "Holy Catholic Church."

Such is the retrograde movement to which such ■ use as my brother makes of the Bible obviously tends. But thanks be to God, the doctrines for which he contends cannot be sustained, even by such testimony as he has brought us from the Bible.

One Scriptural text applied to this theory of two infinitely different natures in one and the same person—one Scriptural text alone, seems to me sufficient to show that it is untrue: although I mean, to-morrow evening, to follow Mr. Lee as far as time will permit, and examine the texts he has offered you as proofs of this strangest of all doctrines. The text to which I refer, was suggested by Rev Mr. Thorn, of Liverpool, England. It is one from which my opponent cannot escape by avoiding one set of statements by referring them to the humanity of Jesus, and another set of statements by referring them to his deity.

Observe, it is God the Son, whom Mr. Lee has represented as becoming incarnate in the body of Jesus; it was God the Son who took humanity into union with Deity; therefore, whenever Jesus, in his human nature, speaks of the divinity that dwelt within him, inspired him, and wrought through him, it must be God the Son to whom he refers, if he spoke in accordance with this doctrine. But it so happens, Jesus never did speak in this way; it was always, "the Father who dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." The New Testament doth not know this doctrine "of two natures in Christ"—does not support its requisitions.

SIXTH EVENING—MARCH 10th.

MR. LEE'S FIRST SPEECH.

This is a long discussion. The audience knows this, but we who have to bear the laboring oar, feel it to be so. Yet there are many things that ask for notice before the direct argument can be advanced any further. Indeed ■ whole evening might be occupied with a review of points not yet noticed by me, in reply to Mr. May's remarks. And before I proceed I must review ■ few things. Some things he has repeated over several times, and they seem to be regarded by Mr. May as the best he can do. It would give me great pleasure to follow him on every point, but this I cannot do for want of time.

Before I take up my line of argument I wish to notice a few incidental matters.

Mr. May complained of me for representing him as not believing in the inspiration of the Scriptures.

This was ungenerous.

1. I took it for granted that he believed in the inspiration of the Scriptures, and reasoned accordingly, until he gave me to understand to the contrary.

I did not intimate that he did not believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures, until I did it upon the authority of his own words.

2. His words were sufficiently explicit to justify me in my inference that he does not admit the Scriptures as an authoritative standard—that he does not believe that Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Peter and Paul, were so inspired as to secure them against error in all they have written.

This was made plain in his appeal to the Rabbis, in proof that Matthew quoted loosely, and made a false application of what he quoted.

This was also implied in his appeal to the poets. He placed the poets of the Bible on a level with other poets for whom no inspiration is claimed.

The same thing was implied in his defence of Theodore Parker. I made no attack upon Mr. Parker, but only quoted him as a Unitarian, as authority against Mr. May, as he had quoted others against me. He defended Mr. Parker and declared that the Unitarians had disowned him—had almost committed the sin of making a creed to get rid of him. His crime is rejecting the Scriptures as divinely inspired. Mr. May defended him, and said that he was one of four who extended to him the hand of Christian fellowship.

Mr. Parker tells us, in so many words, that his religion “ bows to no idols, neither the Church, nor the Bible, nor yet Jesus, but God only. Its redeemer is within, its salvation within, its heaven and its oracle of God.” (Parker’s Discourse, page 361.)

He has over and over again declared that I may pile texts heaven-high, and he will not believe the doctrine I advocate.

Mr. May exclaimed—But against what? against what?

Mr. Lee—Against a single text of Scripture

which commends itself to his reason as teaching the opposite view.

Mr. May—I said against the words of Jesus.

Mr. Lee—He said I might pile texts heaven high in favor of my views, he would not believe the doctrine advocated.

His allusion to Transubstantiation, Baptism, and the Sabbath, was to illustrate the fact that he did not admit the unqualified inspiration of the Scriptures.

3. Though he complains of me for representing him as not believing in the inspiration of the Scriptures, he has not affirmed such belief. Why does he complain of me for representing him as not believing what he fails to declare he does believe? Will he now say that he believes that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were written under the influence of the inspiration of God, and express the truth and nothing but the truth on the subjects of which they treat? Will he do it?

The next point I wish to notice is his new creation argument.

He maintains that in all those texts which I have urged as proof of Christ’s creative power and acts, the material creation is not meant, but the new or moral creation.

Whatever else may be said of our discussion, it may be said of it in truth, that it has brought out some new things, and this is one of them—this new creation. And I now say in reference to it, that—

1. This is a change of ground from his first position. He denied that Christ was the person spoken of in the first of John. Now he admits that the word Logos does denote Christ, as he contends that the creation there spoken of is the new moral heavens, and that Christ made them.

2. His criticism on the word “ by,” is unsound. This Greek particle, with an accusative or genitive, signifies an active cause of any thing. As “ the world was made by him.”

Take a single illustration—“ Which was spoken by the prophet.” Matt. ii. 23.

“ By him were all things created.” Col. i. 16.

If it was the prophet that spoke the word in question, it was Christ that created all things; for the words were spoken “ by” the prophet, and all things were made “ by” Christ.

For the particle “ by” puts the prophet precisely in the same relation to the words spoken,

as it does Christ in relation to the creation of all things. So that, I repeat, if the prophet spake these words, then did Christ do all those things attributed to him.

3. His criticism on the Greek word *aion*, is unsound. He says the word is never used to express the material, visible world. This is a mistake.

"The children of this world marry and are given in marriage. But they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, neither marry nor are given in marriage." Luke xx. 34, 35.

Here the language puts "this world" where they marry in opposition to "that world," where they do not marry. The Greek word *aion* is there used in speaking of this world. But it is not the "new creation." I quote, now, other texts, where the same word is used to express the material world.

"Be not conformed to this world." Romans, xii. 2.

"Not the wisdom of this world, nor the principles of this world, which come to nought." 1st Cor. ii. 6.

"The God of this world." 2d Cor. iv. 4.

"In this world and that which is to come." Eph. i. 21.

"Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high minded, nor trust in uncertain riches." 1st Tim. vi. 17.

"Having loved this present world." 2d Tim. iv. 10.

"Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Heb. xi. 3.

This text clearly speaks of the visible creation, as it speaks of the things that are seen.

In all the above texts the word in the original is *aion* or *aionos*.

Now, no pretext will avail him to prove by criticism that this means the new creation. But if attempted, it would certainly prove very amusing to every Greek scholar in the house.

4. Had he been correct in his Greek criticism it would not have been sustained. For though this word is used in Heb. i. 2, "by whom he made the world," it was the "*kosmos*" world that Christ made.

John i. 10, "He was in the world, and the

world was made by him." Here also the word used is *kosmos*.

It cannot be pretended that this word is used to express the new creation.

5. The world which Christ made comprises earth and heaven.

"Thou Lord hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the* heavens are the work of thy hands." Heb. i. 10.

The Greek word here rendered earth is *gee*. It occurs about 300 times in the New Testament, and is translated, "country, earth, earthly, ground, land, world."

It cannot by any possible means be made to signify the new creation.

The word rendered heaven is "*ouranos*," and is translated "air, heaven, heavenly, sky." It might be made to signify the new heaven, were it not connected with earth, which means this material earth.

6. There are qualifying terms connected with the creation which Christ performed, that prove it to have been the material worlds.

"The heavens and earth which he made, (Heb. i. 10,) are to wax old and pass away."

"They shall perish but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old — doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, but thou art the same and thy years shall not fail." Heb. i. 11, 12.

Now the very heavens and earth of the creation that Christ produced by his power, are to be wrapped up and laid away. Are the new created souls of this "new creation" to wax old, and fail, and be laid away?

"By him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible; whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities or powers; all things were created by him and for him."

Note the terms used—

(1.) "All things."

This includes every kind of creation that had then been performed.

(2.) All "visible" things. This includes the material world.

(3.) All invisible" things. This includes the spiritual world.

(4.) Different orders are specified.

"Thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers," These are supposed to be different orders

of angels. Mr. May said civil governments are meant by principalities.

Are our governments part of the new creation?

7. His criticism on *en arke*, in the beginning, is of no avail.

This word signifies the beginning, and its sense must be determined by the nature of the case.

It signifies the origin or commencement of what ever it is applied to.

But John cannot mean to say the Word, Logos, Christ, was in the beginning of the new dispensation. That would make him assert that Christ was in the beginning of his own gospel. Would any one be likely to suppose he did not exist so early as his own gospel. The gospel bears the name of Christ upon its face; he is its sum and substance, its life and power, and its glory. No one therefore could fail to know that Christ was in the beginning of the gospel.

But suppose the beginning of Creation be meant, and a great truth is revealed, and a Saviour is presented able to save, for he made the world.

8. If I were to abandon all that I have said, and admit that the new Creation is meant, it would not in the least relieve the desperate and sinking cause of my friend. Then would it follow that Christ would have to be omnipotent and omnipresent to carry on the work of the "new Creation." It must require just as much power to renew one heart, as to make a world.

I admit that regeneration may be called a new creation, but almighty power alone can effect it.

The sinner is dead in sin, and cannot bring himself to life.

Dead in trespasses and in sins is the emphatic language of the Scripture. And I care not whether death be the death of the body or the soul, it is the negation of life. When the life of the one or the other is lost, it is lost forever unless renewed by the power that gave it birth. And that power must be omnipotent.

Again, Christ cannot renew hearts where he is not. If he is but a man, and in heaven, how can he create hearts anew on earth?

9. A final objection which I will urge against

my brother's new creation doctrine, is, that the new creation is not performed by Christ, but by the Holy Ghost. Men are created anew in Christ Jesus, but it is by the Holy Ghost.

" But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; Which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour."

It was through Christ as our mediator that the Holy Ghost was given, but it was the Spirit that produced the new creation. Here you have it then. So much for new creation.

MR. MAY'S FIRST SPEECH.

I did not intend to occupy your time with any thing away from the question, but the remark of Mr. Lee about my disbelief of the Scriptures, requires a word. To discuss that is out of place here. But at a proper time I stand ready to discuss with him the origin, authority and inspiration of the Scriptures, or with any other minister of Syracuse; for I have nothing to conceal on this matter. My views differ very materially from the commonly received opinions on those subjects.

Mr. Lee has again, unintentionally do doubt, misrepresented me respecting my quoting from Everett's Defence. But the purpose for which I quoted those passages is fully explained in my former speech, and will be published in full. I refer you to that for all necessary explanation.

My views of the new creation I did not expect would be acceded to by Mr. Lee or any other person at once. I announced to you that they were at variance with the commonly received opinions. And to all his objections to those views, the best answer I can give is to advise you to read it as printed in the published report—consider its positions, compare them with the Scriptures—and I am sure you will find answers there to all the objections brought against them.

Mr. Lee quoted Heb. 1: 10, 11, 12. Now I deny that they refer to Christ, but to the God who anointed him above his fellows. That takes away that text from him so far as I can understand its meaning. But I must leave this and some other subjects for the present, and proceed with the argument, for I am as anxious on this matter as is my brother Lee; not that I am weary of aiding you in ascertaining the

truth, while your patience lasts, but, there may be too much of a good thing.

Mr. Lee offered, as his first argument in support of the two natures of Christ, the inference which he and other Trinitarians draw from the comparison of two classes of texts, which speak of Jesus Christ as man or a man, in whom were exhibited all the usual phenomena of humanity, birth, necessity for food, weariness, need of rest—life, death, with all the affections and feelings that are called out by the trials and temptations of life.

And that class, in which my friend, and those who believe, as he does, think they find evidence, that he was not only called by the names and titles of the Deity, but that he possessed and exercised the attributes of God.

Now Sir, it is the comparison of these classes of texts, which has led me to the opposite conclusion.

Jesus calls himself, and is called by others in the N. T. ■ man forty times—the son of man upwards of eighty times—a prophet or one of the prophets nineteen times. He is called the seed of God fifty-six times—the Son of God with kindred appellations about one hundred and twenty times—a child of God and the servant of God eight times. (See Willison's Proofs.) Jesus assured his disciples that he lived wholly by the father; that he could do nothing of himself; that his doctrine was not his own, but his that sent him. He declared that all his powers, mighty ■ they were, were given him of God.

The men of his generation did not suspect that he was the incarnate Jehovah, or they might have shrunk from the attempt to put him to death. He did not declare himself to them, and on one occasion when they accused him of having made himself equal with God, (John v. 18,) he justified the language he had used, by reminding his accusers of the higher titles, than he had taken, which used to be bestowed upon the prophets. The wonderful miracles, which he wrought on some occasions, so astonished the people as to draw from them the exclamation, God is with him; but never seems to have awakened the supposition, that he might be God himself.

Even his immediate disciples, the twelve that accompanied with him during his ministry, heard not only his public discourses and parables, but received much instruction from him in private, ■ not to have learned this stupendous fact from him before his crucifixion. They never intimated to the priests and rulers, that they

were intending to put God to death; and so little confidence had they in his power, that when Jesus was betrayed by one of their number, another, the boldest of them all, denied him, and the rest forsook him and fled.

And after they had seen him alive again, and received his final instructions, and witnessed his ascension, we cannot find a single instance in any of their discourses, in which they declared that their beloved master was God incarnate. Turn, Mr. Chairman, to the Acts of the Apostles, and read for yourself each and every one of their discourses, and find if you can my friend Lee's doctrine respecting Christ declared in either one of them. Now, Sir, a doctrine like this—one, too, that was to be as my brother told us last evening it is the basis, the corner stone of the whole religion of Christ, we might expect would appear not only very plainly, but very frequently, in the discourses of the first promulgators of this new religion. What would be thought of the ministers of the present day, who believe the doctrine of the two natures of Christ, if it should never appear in their discourses or prayers? I suspect their reputation for orthodoxy would not be much better than mine is.

Now, Sir, as actions speak louder than words, and always have, I cannot help being much affected in forming my opinions of Christian doctrine, by what I learn from the Acts of the Apostles. So when I come to read what was written some years after the events and speeches that are recorded in that book—when I read the narratives which four of them wrote of the ministry of Jesus, and the Epistles which several others addressed to the Churches, with which they had been connected, and that most enigmatical of all books, "the Revelation," the authorship of which is not known and the contents of which have puzzled the most ingenious commentators—I say, Sir, when I come to read these books, and find those passages, on which my friend Lee relies so much to sustain his incomprehensible doctrine, I feel bound, Sir, to look at those passages in the light of other Scriptures. Not one of them states the doctrine of "the Trinity," or the doctrine of "the two natures in Christ," as he holds it, and therefore I must interpret them to mean what seems to me to be the most in accordance with the Sacred Scriptures, in which these passages occur.

I find, in ■ number of instances, divine titles given to Jesus Christ, though not one instance, in which the peculiar name of Jehovah is indis-

putably bestowed upon him. But, on turning to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, with which all the writers of the New had been familiar from their youth up, I find very many instances in which the names of God are given to his distinguished messengers, or to persons, who in the course of his providence were raised up for some especial purpose. I have already, on a former evening, mentioned these names; and I was astonished last evening, to hear Mr. Lee declare that no mere human being could or would have been called "Immanuel," or "the Mighty God," "the Everlasting Father," "the Prince of Peace," when so many orthodox commentators—Grotius, Lemborch, Gataker, White and Calmet amongst the earlier, and Horne, J. P. Smith and Prot. Stuart amongst the latter writers since the Reformation—all allow that those names were primarily bestowed upon some person or persons born about the time or soon after the prophecies were uttered. I have not time to go over this matter again, but shall leave Mr. Lee at variance with those high authorities so long as he sees fit to remain so. Certainly, whoever will read the 7th, 8th and 9th Chapters of Isaiah, will receive the impression, that these wonderful names were first bestowed upon some one who lived in the days of the Prophet, and were bestowed primarily upon that person by the same inspiration that bestowed them secondarily upon Christ. I find on reading the Scriptures, other names of God, that were bestowed upon distinguished men, and therefore I infer, that no proof of the Deity of Christ can be found in the fact, that such titles may have been given him.

And as to the evidence, which Mr. Lee seemed to bring in a formidable array of texts, that the attributes of Deity were ascribed to Jesus, I must again insist that all that evidence is dissipated by Christ's own explicit disclaimers of those attributes.

Mr. Lee next insisted that the evidences of Christ's *pre-existence* all go to show that he possessed two natures. It might be sufficient to say in reply to this, that all the Arians, of the earliest and of the latest times, have contended stoutly for this doctrine of the pre-existence, and yet have denied his Deity.

The pre-existence of *all* human souls has been believed by many heathen as well as Christian philosophers, especially since the days of Plato. And lately the Rev. Dr. Edward Beecher, an eminent orthodox divine, has published a volume, "The Conflict of Ages," in which he main-

tains this doctrine as the only avenue to the solution of the fallen state of humanity in this present world.

I frankly confess, that I have not made up my mind upon this point. But I am satisfied that if Jesus of Nazareth did exist before he lived on this earth, it would by no means follow, that he was God as well as man; for all the reasons that the Arians urged on this point, and many more that might be added if it were necessary.

But Mr. Lee quoted vi. 62. "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?"

To understand this passage we must first consider the meaning of a previous one, John iii. 13, which I am not sure though I think Mr. Lee did quote last evening. Certainly it is as much to his purpose ■ any that he brought forward. It is, "No man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the ■ of man which is in heaven."

Mr. Lee said—I did not quote it on that point last night.

Mr. May—Ah, well. I was designing to comment upon it, and he will pardon me for introducing it, for it is ■ real good one for his side.

Mr. Lee--Yes, but I want to make my own quotations.

Mr. May—To be sure. Well, then I take that part back, and will only say ■ few things preparatory to the exposition of the passage he did quote. And here I am reminded of a ludicrous criticism on the mode some people have of quoting Scripture. I am almost ashamed to introduce it, and yet the quotations made by my brother, while they do not warrant such a criticism, do remind me of this illustration of the mode. You can prove any thing from the Scripture by putting detached portions together. It is said in one place, "And Judas went and hanged himself"; again, "Go thou and do likewise." And yet again it is said, "That thou doest do quickly."

But to return to the argument.

If the Scriptures of the Old Testament be true then the declaration of Jesus in this passage cannot be understood literally "that no ■ hath ascended up to heaven," because we have accounts of the translations to that blissful region of Enoch and of Elijah. It was also not literally true that Christ, since he became the son of man, had ever been there, allowing it, for the sake of the argument, to be a *place*, a far-off region. We have no account of any es-

ension of our Lord until that, which took place after his resurrection from the dead. The literal sense of this passage, therefore, cannot be the true one. And if ascending up to heaven cannot be taken in a literal sense, neither can coming down from heaven be understood of a literal descent, but each must be interpreted in conformity with the other. Now according to common and ordinary ways of thinking and speaking, heaven is supposed to be upwards, and those who wish to be acquainted with the will of God must ascend (in thought at least) to be informed concerning it. Our Lord following this popular idea, and adapting his discourse to it, makes use of these figurative expressions, that no other one was so fully acquainted as himself with the divine counsels or designs for the welfare and happiness of the human race, because he was continually in heaven, that is, in a heavenly state of mind, dwelling in thought on those subjects and holding continual communion with the Heavenly Father. It certainly will not do to understand this last clause, "the ■ of man which is in heaven," literally, because it cannot be true that the *son of man*, the material fleshy part of Jesus Christ, could have come down from heaven and have been in heaven at the same time. It would be equal in absurdity to the doctrine of transubstantiation to suppose this. The whole passage therefore must be figurative, describing in this imagery the spiritual elevation, heavenly mindedness of Jesus; that while he was in the midst of the scenes and excitements of earth, he was dwelling upon those high themes, which Nicodemus could not comprehend, until he should become less earthly minded and literal.

I am very much confirmed in the correctness of this interpretation, and am the more sure it is the just one, because I find similar language used in the Old Testament. Thus Moses speaking to the Jews concerning the will of God says to them (Deut. xxx. 12), "It is not in heaven that thou shouldest say who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us that we may hear it and do it—14, but the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart that thou mayest do it." So in Prov. xxx. 4, "Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended, what is his name and what is his son's name if thou canst tell?" The plain meaning then of our Lord's words, when stripped of their metaphorical dress, was no more than this: I the son of man, the Messiah, alone am fully acquainted with the divine will, or the counsels of the

Father; his presence is ever with me, and therefore these heavenly things, of which I speak, are as well known to me, as if I had ascended up to heaven and received instructions from the Father of light.

Now, I think we are prepared to ascertain the meaning of the vi. John 62, "What and if ye shall see the son of man ascend up where he was before?" It is certainly an obscure text, and cannot be taken literally by my friend on the other side, any more than by myself. For he will not contend that the second person of his Trinity was the Son of man, until he was incarnated; and surely he will not aver that this whole complex being was in heaven, (considered as a place above this world,) until after his death, resurrection and ascension. Some other sense than the literal one, therefore, seemed to be the true one. The very learned Dr. Lardner says this passage should not be understood literally, "and thinks that our Lord intended by it only to say, that he should not be always personally here." The words seem however to me to mean much more. The utmost that could be inferred from these words understood literally, would be that the Son of Man had been perhaps at the commencement of his ministry taken up into heaven, and there instructed in the divine counsels. This was the opinion of Socinius, and of the early Polish Unitarians, who supposed that he was taken up into heaven, before he commenced his public ministry, as Moses was called up into Mount Sinai, or as Paul was caught up into the third heavens, and there received the divine command. Of this however there is no account nor any thing that bears a resemblance to such ■ occurrence in his life, except it be, his sojourn of 40 days in the wilderness immediately after his baptism.

I think, however, by attending to the context of the prayer before us, we can discover our Lord's meaning, assisted by the light we received in contemplating the other passage iii. 13.

A few verses before the one we are attempting to explain, Jesus had said I ■ the living bread, which came down from heaven—meaning of course—that his doctrine was from God, and that it was necessary to the life of the soul of every man. He presses upon every one the necessity of receiving it, embracing it, understanding it, digesting it, that it may become the food of the soul. Eating ■ doctrine or the books that contains it, is not an unheard of expression, even in our days. Lord Bacon, in his admira-

ble essay on studies, says ' Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested.' Baruk, the scribe of Jeremiah, was directed to eat the book he had written at the direction of the prophet—that is make the contents of it wholly his own. Now this seems to me to open to us the meaning of our Lord in the passage beginning with the fourth verse of this chapter, which has been as we Protestants think so strangely perverted by our Roman Catholic brethren.

Whether his disciples at the moment understood him is doubtful. They thought it a hard doctrine, which it seems to me they could not have done, if they had apprehended his meaning to be that his doctrines must enter into the minds and hearts of men, in order that they may be profited by them.

Seeing that they misunderstood him, he said, "What and if ye see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?" What if I should go away from you—withdraw myself from you into the contemplative retirement, in which I lived thirty years before I commenced my ministry—you would still have with you my doctrine, the fruit of the spirit that is in me; and it is that which must strengthen, guide, govern you, not my personal presence with you. "It is needful for you that I go away," he said to them on another occasion, "for if I go not away, the comforter, which is the spirit of truth, will not come unto you."

MR. LEE'S SECOND SPEECH.

The points to be proved are, that the Holy Ghost is of one substance power and eternity with the Father, existing personally distinct, yet in unity of the Godhead.

I. The Holy Ghost is called by the names by which God is known. "And one cried to another, and said, Holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory. Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then I said, here am I, send me. And he said, go and tell this people. Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not." Isa. vi. 3, 8, 9.

The point here is this, the Lord sent the prophet Isaiah.

The speaker said, whom shall I send, and who will go for us. Us, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost was the speaker who sent Isaiah, and he is called the Lord,

the Jehovah. This is proved by the words of Paul.

"And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word; Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, Saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive :" Acts xxviii. 25, 26.

The prophet says, the Lord, the Jehovah sent him, and told him what to say.

Paul says he spake by the Holy Ghost, or rather that the Holy Ghost spake by the prophet.

"And he called the name of the place Massah, and Meribah, because of the chiding of the children of Israel, and because the tempted the Lord, saying, Is the Lord among us, or not? Exo. xvii. 7.

Compare this with Heb. iii. 7-9. "Wherefore (as the Holy Ghost saith, To-day, if ye will hear his voice, Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness; When your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years."

In the first of these texts it is affirmed that they tempted the Lord, Jehovah.

In the second the Holy Ghost says, "your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years."

"And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ. Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: For mine eyes have seen thy salvation." Luki ii. 26, 29, 30.

Here, what was revealed to him by the Holy Ghost, he calls "thy word," addressing the Lord.

"But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." John. i. 12, 13.

"For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." 1 John, 4.

"Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of

the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John iii. 5.

In the first two of these texts, men are said to be born of God.

In the third text, they are said to be born of the Spirit.

"But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? While it remained, was it not in thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thy heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." Acts. v. 3, 4.

The conduct of Ananias is called lying to the Holy Ghost; and in the next breath it is declared to be lying unto God.

The Holy Ghost, then is God.

"Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." Acts ii. 24.

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." 1 Peter iii. 18.

In the first of these texts, it is said that God raised Christ from the dead.

In the second, it is declared that he was quickened by the Spirit.

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." 2 Tim. iii. 16.

In accordance with this declaration we read, "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak unto the children of Israel," &c.

"Then came the word of the Lord to Isaiah, saying" &c. Isa. xxxviii. 4.

So Jeremiah says, "Moreover the word of the Lord came unto me saying." Jer. ii. 1.

"The word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel," Eze. i. 3.

"The word of the Lord that came unto Hozea." Hozea i. 1.

"The word of the Lord that came unto Joel." Joel i. 1.

"The word of the Lord came unto Jonah." Jonah i. 1.

"The burden of the word of the Lord to Israel by Malachi." i. 1.

"For the prophecy came not in old time by

the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Peter i. 2.

It is obvious from these remarks that the Holy Ghost is God. The word of the Lord came but it came by the Holy Ghost.

II. Personal actions are, throughout the Scriptures, attributed to the Holy Ghost, Holy Spirit, and Spirit of God.

"And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light." Gen. ii. 3.

The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters—God said let there be light. Here is a clear distinction of persons.

"Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth." Ps. cvi. 30.

God is the sender, and the Spirit is the sent. The Spirit is represented as creating.

"Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; If I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there.

If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; Even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." Ps. cxxxix. 7-10.

The Spirit of God, and the presence of God are represented as two things.

Both are represented as every where.

"The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek." Isa. lxi. 1.

"And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." Luke. iv. 21.

What was upon him, if we deny the personality of the Spirit.

"Then the spirit took me up, and I heard behind me a voice of a great rushing, saying, Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place, I heard also the noise of the wings of the living creatures that touched one another, and the noise of the wheels over against them, and a noise of a great rushing. So the spirit lifted me up, and took me away, and I went in bitterness, in the heat of my spirit; but the hand

of the Lord was strong upon me." Ezekiel iii. 12-14.

Here the Spirit actually transported the prophet.

" And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water : and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him : And, lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Matt. iii. 16, 17.

Here we see Christ coming up from the water, the Spirit descending, and the Father speaking from heaven.

" Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil." Matt. iv. 1.

The Spirit here performed a personal action.

" But when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate ; but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye : for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost." Mark xiii. 11.

The Holy Ghost is here said to speak in or through men. This implies intelligence, ■ well ■ personality.

" And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them : And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, ■ the Spirit gave them utterance." Acts. ii. 3, 4.

" Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot." Acts viii. 29.

" Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts xx. 28.

Here is an official act said to have been done by the Holy Ghost.

" The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God : Rom. viii. 16.

How can the Spirit bear witness with our Spirits if it is not ■ personal identity and agent.

" Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities : for we know not what we should pray for as we ought : but the Spirit itself maketh

intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." Rom. viii. 26.

The Spirit, to help, must be, not only ■ personal identity, but an intelligent active agent, or power.

" But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth :" 2 Thes. ii. 13.

Here the Spirit is represented ■ the great agent in our salvation.

We are sanctified by the Spirit.

" Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils : 1 Tim. iv. 1.

" How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God ?" Heb. ix. 14.

Here we have the whole Trinity.

Christ offering himself, through the eternal Spirit, to God the Father.

The Spirit possesses the attribute of eternity.

" And the spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come : and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely," Rev. xxii. 17.

III. There are many texts of Scripture, which not only imply the personality of the Holy Ghost, but which can never be explained upon any other principle.

" Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men : but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him : but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Matt. xii. 31, 32.

Call the Holy Ghost what you may, this text will never make sense, unless you admit its personality.

Call it an attribute of God.

Call it the power of God.

Call it a manifestation of God.

Call it the influence of God.

There is no ground for the unpardonableness of the sin, if you deny the personality of the Spirit.

"And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him; and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased." Luke iii. 22.

No one can tell what it was that descended, if the personal existence of the Holy Ghost be denied.

Let my opponent tell what we are to understand by the Holy Ghost in this text.

"Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye." Acts. vii. 51.

Here the Holy Ghost is made to be a uniform something which both they and their fathers resisted.

What did they resist?

"While Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said unto him, Behold, three men seek thee." Acts x. 19.

Can any one tell what or who spake to Peter, without admitting the personality of the Spirit?

"How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with him." Acts x. 38.

With what did God anoint Jesus?

With himself? With one of his attributes? With a divine manifestation?

"As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them." Acts xiii. 2.

Here the Holy Ghost represents himself as a personal identity, by applying to himself the personal pronoun *me*, and *I*. Here are three points:

1. The Holy Ghost had called Barnabas and Paul.

2. The Holy Ghost spake to the church or their leaders.

3. The Holy Ghost required that they be set apart for him or to him. Separate *me*, &c.

"And when Paul had laid his hand upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied." Acts xix. 6.

There was something that came on them. What was it?

It was something which gave them the use of language before unknown.

It was something which gave them views of truth not before possessed, for they prophesied or taught.

What was that which came upon them and did all this, called the Holy Ghost?

"And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: 1 Cor. ii. 4.

The Spirit is here represented as a convincing or proof giving agent, attending and operating through Paul's preaching. What was it?

But God hath revealed *them* unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." 1 Cor. ii. 10.

1. God reveals the high and holy things he has prepared for us.

2. This is done by the Spirit.

3. And this revelation the Spirit is capable of making, because he searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God."

How can this be explained?

If by the Spirit you mean God himself, or any of his attributes, denying the distinction of persons in the Godhead, you make Paul say that God reveals these unto us by himself, and that God searches the deep things of himself.

If you deny the essential divinity of the Spirit, you make some created or mere ideal being search the deep things of God.

For through him we both have an access by one Spirit unto the Father." Eph. ii. 18.

The word "both," denotes Jews and Gentiles both come to God by the same way.

Here we have the whole Trinity.

1. We have access to the Father, the first person in the Trinity.

2. This access is through Christ, the Son, the second person in the Trinity.

3. This access to the Father through the Son, is by the Spirit, the third person in the Trinity.

- Deny the personality of the Spirit and who can tell by whom or by what it is that we have to the Father through Christ?

What is this third agent.

4. The difficulty which must attend every attempt to explain what the Holy Ghost is, if its divinity and personality be denied, must go far to confirm the Trinitarian view.

What is the all-pervading, enlightening, sanctifying and saving agent called the Holy Ghost?

1. Is it a created spirit, as an angel, or any created being.

It cannot be for many reasons.

(1.) It is called "the eternal Spirit." Heb. 9. 14.

(2.) It is called the Holy Spirit, Holy Ghost God's Spirit, and the Spirit of God, by way of distinction. If it be a created being, it is no more the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit of God, than an angel or the Spirit of a just man made perfect, for they are God's and are holy.

(3.) The Holy Ghost, so called, is one, but created spirits are, with us, numberless. There is an innumerable company of angels and spirits of just men made perfect. They are all holy spirits, and yet there is but one Holy Spirit, called the Holy Spirit.

(4.) The works which are attributed to the Holy Ghost clearly prove that he is no created spirit.

"The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Gen. i. 2.

"By his Spirit he garnished the heavens." Job. xxvi. 13.

He inspired the prophets. "Holy men of God spake, — they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Peter i. 21.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." 2 Tim. iii. 16.

If the Holy Ghost that inspired the prophets was a created being, it is not given by inspiration of God.

The Holy Ghost overshadowed Mary the Mother of Jesus, and he was begotten by the Holy Ghost. Mary — his mother, but was a created being his father? What was that being?

The Holy Ghost is the Regenerator and Sanctifier of mankind.

"Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost :" Titus iii. 5.

He who would trust the renewal of his heart to any created being does not know himself, the depth and strength of the depravity of his heart.

(5.) The fact that the one only unpardonable sin is a sin against the Holy Ghost, proves that he cannot be a created being.

MR. MAY'S SECOND SPEECH.

Mr. Lee quoted Ex. iii. 14, and John viii. 58, in connection, as if the latter had reference to the former and was intended to declare that Jesus was the great "I am."

But if you will look at these passages in the light which orthodox commentators alone have thrown upon them, you will see that there is no soundness in this witness to what he wishes to prove.

Exodus iii. 14, "And God said unto Moses, I — that I am."

Now the literal meaning of the words so translated is, "I will be that I will be." So it is translated by Tindale, called the Apostle of England, and who was among the first as he — among the most illustrious martyrs to the Protestant cause in 1536. So it is translated by Le Clerc, Prof. of Hebrew and *Belles Lettres* in the Remonstrant College at Amsterdam, who flourished at the beginning of the last century. And Dr. Adam Clarke says "the original words literally signify 'I will be what I will be.'" Any being may say, I am that I am, for surely every one is what he is. But God alone can say, "I will be that I will be," for he alone is exempt from influences that might make him what he would not be.

The connection in which our Lord's words stand, (John viii. 58), "before Abraham was I am," is sufficient to explain them. He said, v. 56, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad." How did that patriarch see "the day of the Son of man," the time when Christ commenced the redemption of the world? He could only have seen it with a prophetic eye, — it was placed before him in the divine promise. The Jews misconstrued our Saviour's words, and said, "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?" Jesus had not said that he had seen Abraham, or that Abraham had seen him, only that the patriarch had seen *his day*. So he replied with emphasis, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am," that is, I, — the Messiah, the promised one, I was pla-

ced before Abraham's view in prophetic vision, and he rejoiced in the prospect of my coming, though you, who call him your father, are hating and persecuting me. This interpretation of the passage agrees with the context and all the circumstances.

I am assured of the correctness of this exposition by high orthodox authorities on another point. Grotius, Kuinoel, Rosenmuller, Schlesinger, Le Clerc, John Pye Smith, and others, all concur, as I learn from "Concessions of Trinitarians," and I know most of them do, in saying that the word "*ego eimi*," should have been rendered "I was." And in proof that the present tense is often put for the imperfect, they appeal to Psalms xc. 2; Prov. viii. 25; Jer. i. 5; John i. 19, ix. 8, 35, xiv. 9, xv. 27.

Grotius says, "Jesus was before Abraham in the divine decree," and refers to John xvii. 5; Luke xv. 31; John i. 23, ix. 8-25, xv. 27.

Beza, the colleague and successor of Calvin in the Church and University of Geneva, says, "I do not think that Christ here simply speaks of himself as God, but as he was seen by Abraham with the eye of faith, namely, — mediator between God and man, or God manifested in the flesh; for otherwise he would seem not to have spoken to the purpose."

Dr. John Pye Smith, in his Scripture testimony to the Messiah, says, "Some suppose that in using the expression 'I am,' our Lord intended a reference to the divine appellation announced to Moses, 'I am that which I am.' But it is to be remarked that the words of that passage are in the future tense, 'I will be that which I will be,' (Exod. iii. 14,) and most probably it was not intended — name, but as a declaration of the certain fulfillment of all the promises of God, especially those which related to the deliverance of the Israelites. There does not appear, therefore, sufficient ground to sustain the idea of an allusion to this." Vol. 1, page 16.

But this is not all that I have to say upon this passage, which has been twice or thrice quoted by Mr. Lee, and in a manner to show that he places great dependence upon it.

In all other places where the words *ego eimi* occur they are translated "I am he." There are two instances in this very chapter. Verse 24, "If ye believe not that '*ego eimi*' I am he, ye shall die in your sins." Verse 28, "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but — my Father taught me, I speak these things."

John iv. 26, "I that speak unto thee am he," (*ego eimi*)

John xiii. 19, "Now I tell you before it come to pass, that, when it come to pass, ye may believe that I am he."

These are sufficient, though very many more examples might be brought forward, in which the translators of our English Bible have inserted the "he" after the "I am." Not a similar case to the one we are considering can be found where they have omitted this addition. Why they omitted it here is evident I think. They were believers in the doctrine Mr. Lee is attempting to support, and thinking they saw here an allusion to Exod. iii. 14, they translated the phrase more literally than they had done elsewhere.

"And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." John xvii. 5.

This text Mr. Lee evidently regards — a very strong one in favor of the pre-existence and self-existence of Jesus Christ. But he cannot have attended to certain peculiarities in the original languages of the Bible.

God said to Abraham, "I have made thee the father of many nations," when as yet he had not a son. The language is not "I will make thee hereafter," but, "I have made thee the father of many nations." Now, what else could have been the meaning of this but that it was the divine intention, and would be brought about in the future providence of God, that many nations should descend from that righteous man. I say, therefore, in the same sense, that Abraham was the father of many nations before he had yet — son—so Christ had the glory for which he now prayed—he had it with the Father before the world was, that is, in divine foresight and intention.

If we arrange our Lord's words in the order in which they stand in the original Greek, we may perhaps find some authority from that order itself, for affixing to them the sense I propose. "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had before the world was with thee."

The glory he prays for, was a glory that had not yet been in his own possession, but was with the Father, not only as everything that comes to pass must, in one sense have been, i. e. in his foresight, but Christ's glory was with the Father before the world was, or before the Christian age commenced, in the divine intention. It was a part of the divine counsel from the very first,

that the Messiah should be glorified, and that his faithful followers should share in the divine grace and mercy by him.

Accordingly it is said, (Eph. i. 3, 4,) "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings, in heavenly places in Christ, according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world."

Thus also we read, (2 Tim. i. 9,) "Who (God) hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the world began." And our Lord represents himself as saying to the righteous at the day of judgment, (Matt. xxv. 34,) "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

I would therefore interpret the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the passage we have been considering, (according to the Hebrew phraseology, and the general sense of Scripture,) as referring to the glory that was intended for him, or laid up in the divine, all-foreseeing mind before the day of redemption began, or before the world was. So that our Lord, after having glorified the Father on the earth, and finished the work which he had given him to do, now requests in prayer that glory which he knew was destined for him—the glory of being the Saviour of the world. As yet little appeared to have been accomplished by his ministry. There were few who ventured to become his followers and embrace his religion. He was about to be crucified. Still he felt sure of the triumph of his truth. He foresaw that his gospel would triumph in the world; and in the confidence of this faith, even in that dark hour, he prayed that it might be even so.

To show you still further that this is the true exposition of this important passage, let me ask you, my brother, to look again into your New Testament, and see if the glory for which Christ prayed be not the same glory which the Apostles spoke of as actually received by him. And still further, did he not pray for this glory as the *reward* of a work done by him upon the earth, and did not the Apostles speak of it as given to him as the reward of what he had done and suffered upon earth? And I ask, once, how could the glory which you supposed Christ possessed before he appeared on earth, or had done any part of the work, how could that possibly be the *reward* of a work done by him upon

earth, of his obedience and sufferings? It seems to me my friend can answer this but the same way I should.

Let me only add, sir, in justice to our disinterested Lord and Saviour, that the glory for which he prayed was not personal enjoyment or selfish exaltation. No. As he said on a former occasion, he came not, he lived not, he died not to seek his own glory. His petition was, that notwithstanding the dark clouds that seemed to be settling about him and his cause—his petition was that that cause might triumph—the gracious purposes of God—the sanctification and redemption of the world might be crowned with the most glorious success. He doubtless uttered this prayer more in sympathy with the failing hearts of his disciples than on his own account. For he says, verse 13, "Now come I to thee, and these things I speak in the world, that they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves." And in the 22d verse he prays, "The glory which thou hast given me I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one, I in them and them in me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may know that thou hast sent them as thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me."

I cannot but think, sir, that the exposition I have now offered will approve itself to my friend on the other side, when he shall have considered more the usages of the Jewish language, and shall have compared more carefully Scripture with Scripture on this point. Would to God that we all of us studied the Bible much more in the light that radiates from its own pages, and much less in the shadows that are projected upon its pages by our educational prejudices and sectarian opinions.

"And, without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." 1 Tim. iii. 16.

For my part, I am unable to see the reason why my brother Lee and Trinitarians generally, should put so much confidence in this text, even allowing it to stand just as it does in our common translation. The being here spoken of as God manifest in the flesh, could not have been the High and Holy One, who is from everlasting to everlasting *the same*, without a shadow of change, in his very nature exalted, glorious beyond our utmost thought, invisible, whom no eye hath seen or can see, ■■■ cannot consistently suppose it to be the supreme God

who is here spoken of in this passage, for here we read that he was manifest in flesh, that he had a person which mortal eyes could look upon : nay, more, that he was received up into glory, that is, underwent a change from a lower to a higher state of glory ; nay, further still, that he who is all perfect was justified.

Now this cannot be truly said of the supreme deity, unless we may contradict some of the plainest declarations of Scripture respecting him.

And as we have seen that the title "God," is frequently bestowed upon the prophets, angels, and messengers of the Most High, we may infer that it must be some such one who is here spoken of, and can have little doubt that it was Jesus Christ, God's most illustrious messenger—nay, his dearly beloved Son, in whom, as in ■■■■■ express image of himself, the heavenly Father hath more clearly manifested himself to the world than by any other prophet or angel.

So far as my argument against the proposition before us is concerned, I should be willing to leave this text with the comment I have now made upon it. But as so much reliance is put upon this passage, ■ if it were one of the corner stones of the whole edifice of orthodoxy, I feel that it is my duty still further to show how this stone has been crumbled in pieces, or at least so far broken that even many stout defenders of the Trinity do not place much dependence upon it.

So long ago ■■■■■ Grotius, who flourished in the early days of the Protestant Reformation, the common reading of the original of this text was called in question by him and other biblical scholars ; and it was more than intimated by them, that instead of "God" was manifest in the flesh, the real original required us to read either "which was," or "he who was manifested in the flesh;" they who understand Greek know how easily the abbreviations of the words that mean "God," "which" and "who" might be mistaken for each other.

Less than a century afterwards, Sir Isaac Newton, "whose piety swelled responsive to his knowledge," and who was as great a theologian almost as he was astronomer. He wrote a Tract, in which he showed that the passage ought to have been translated "Great is the mystery of godliness, which was manifested in the flesh"; that having been the reading in all the churches for the first four or five hundred years, and of the authors of all the ancient versions, Jerome as well ■■■■■ the rest.

Bishop Marsh, one of the most illustrious biblical scholars that ever wore a mitre in the English Episcopal Church, says in his Notes to Michaelis's Introduction, Vol. II. p. 84, that the common reading (God) "is not found a *prima manu*, in a single ancient manuscript in uncial letters, nor in a single ancient version except the Arabic, which is of very doubtful authority." Concessions p. 514.

Dr. John Pye Smith, the savor of whose orthodoxy has been for the last fifty years even more redolent than that of his learning, confesses evidently with much reluctance, "that the reasons in favor of reading (he who) are so weighty as to render the whole case very perplexing, and, he apprehends incapable of being determined so as to dissipate all the doubts of a conscientious inquirer. Concessions p. 513—Script. Test. Vol. III. 322.

And Dr. Adam Clarke, the great and certainly very learned Methodist Commentator, who never yields any thing that he can with any fairness hold on to as a proof of the deity of Christ, acknowledges that he is "perplexed by various readings of the clause 'God was manifest in the flesh,' for instead of God several manuscripts, versions and fathers have who or which." Commentary in Loc.

Many more witnesses against the common reading might be brought forward, but these, I trust, will be enough to show that my brother Lee, and other Trinitarians, who rely much upon this passage, are leaning upon ■■■■■ broken reed.

The very context of this passage, it seems to me, plainly intimates that some other doctrine, than that usually deduced from it, was in the mind of the writer. He was earnestly exhorting Timothy, a young minister of the Gospel, to seek after and maintain in himself, and do all in his power to promote in others, the virtues and graces of those, who belong to the Church of the living God. How natural that his thoughts should turn, and that he should wish to fasten the thoughts of his beloved son, upon the brightest pattern of a god-like man, which the world had then, or has since, ever beheld ; in whom was first made manifest in *all perfection* the spirit of true holiness, the spirit of God in the life of man. That such purity, holiness, steadfastness in virtue under every temptation, such fearlessness, moral courage, self-sacrifice, were possible in man, had never before been conceived. It was the mystery of god-likeness never until now revealed—revealed in him,

Jesus of Nazareth, "who was manifest in the flesh, was justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

I do not expect my opponent in this discussion, nor a great many of my auditors, will accept at once this explanation of this famous passage. But I beg of them to give it due consideration before they fling it away from their minds. It is an explanation, to which they may find some approximation in a very popular orthodox book, "The Corner Stone," by Jacob Abbott, pp. 12, 13. "He (God) brings out the purity, and spotlessness, and moral glory of the Divinity, through the workings of a human mind, called into existence for this purpose, and stationed in a most conspicuous attitude among men. * * * * The moral perfections of Divinity show themselves to us in the only way by which, so far as we can see, it is possible directly to show them, by coming out in action, in the very field of human duty, by a mysterious union with a human intellect and human powers. It is God manifest in the flesh; the visible image of an all pervading Deity—himself forever invisible.

SEVENTH EVENING—MARCH 14.

MR. LEE'S FIRST SPEECH.

I resume the direct argument.

2. Is the Holy Ghost called an attribute of God? The subject will be beset with equal difficulties, and shrouded in equal mystery.

(1.) It suggests the question, what, or which attribute of Jehovah is the Holy Ghost?

The attributes of God are known only as God has revealed himself. To say that the Holy Ghost is an attribute of God, is to say that it is one of the known attributes. What is it?

Is it his eternity. Certainly not for that is a mere fact and quality which pertains to all the attributes of God.

Is it his omnipotence or power? It cannot be for it is more than power: The Holy Ghost develops intelligence and volition, neither of which belong to power as a distinct attribute.

"The Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul." Acts. xiii. 2.

"It seemed good to the Holy Ghost." Acts xv. 28.

Moreover, power has no existence only as it resides in an operative agent. To say, therefore, that the Holy Ghost is the power of God,

as an attribute, is to say that it is God himself. Is it his omnipresence?

Surely not. This is a mere quality of the divine essence, or mode of the divine existence. The intelligence, will, and personal actions of the Holy Ghost cannot be referred to the mere quality of existing every where.

Is it his omniscience or knowledge? The Holy Ghost exerts a power that does not belong to mere knowledge.

The Spirit transported the prophet. Eze. iii. 13. "Then the spirit took me up, and I heard behind me a voice of a great rushing, saying, Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place."

Is it his immutability—Surely not. This will not only, not be pretended, but it is impossible that immutability, a distinct attribute, should be capable of such manifestations and actions as are attributed to the Holy Ghost. Immutability is a quality that pertains to all the other attributes, and pervades the divine nature.

Is it said that it is the attribute of Justice? It cannot be, for it administers grace and comfort, entirely beyond the ministrations of pure justice.

Is it Goodness, love, or mercy? Surely not. The Spirit is light and power, and exerts physical and moral energy as well as to communicate goodness grace and love.

The Spirit, or Holy Ghost, then, is no one attribute of God.

3. Is there any thing else that you can call the Holy Ghost, which will designate him as something less than divinity itself?

Is it an emanation from God. It cannot be. This would prove that it is God himself, or else that God is divisible and that parts become detached and fly off.

Is it the influence of God? No, for influence is but another word for power, and like power, cannot exist only as it resides in, and is exerted by the agent to which it belongs. The influence of God is God himself, exerting his own power just as a thought is the mind thinking.

Is it the exerted energy of God? No, for the exerted energy of God, is but another word for the influence or power of God, and can be nothing more nor less than God acting.

There can then be no account given of the Holy Ghost, if the Trinitarian view be denied?

I have a few incidental points to notice in my remarks this evening before continuing the direct arguments.

The first is his challenge, or offer to discuss with me or any other clergyman in Syracuse, the origin, authority, and inspiration of the Scriptures.

Of course, he denies what he supposes to be the received opinion of Trinitarians concerning their origin, authority and inspiration, how else could he discuss these points with me?

I will only add, that though I am not disposed to arrest the present discussion, to contract for another, yet if he shall call upon me for such a discussion at a future convenient time, I will try to furnish him with an opponent.

Another matter to which I wish to call the attention of the audience, is his attempted caricature of my method of quoting Scripture. It was this:—He cited the following expressions, as illustrating my method of quoting Scripture.

"Judas went and hanged himself;" "Go thou and do likewise;" "That thou doest, do quickly."

I appeal to the audience in proof that I have made no quotations which can justify any such representation.

I challenge Mr. May to produce one case from all my quotations on which he could suppose he had any ground for that representation.

As a man, a gentleman, and a Christian, I place myself upon a level above that and all that may be like it.

Mr. May here rose and said—May I explain just now? I did not say that these quotations illustrated Mr. Lee's method of quoting Scripture. I said I was reminded of this criticism by some of his quotations. But you will remember Sir, that I said at the time, that I was almost ashamed of it. And I was ashamed of it before it passed my lips. I was ashamed of it as soon as it was out of my mouth. And I am ashamed of it now, Sir. And if it is deemed necessary I will beg Mr. Lee's pardon.

Oh said Mr. Lee pleasantly, that is abundantly sufficient. I am perfectly satisfied.

Mr. May has made one reply in substance, to me on several points. It has been repeated with little variations, in reply to my argument founded upon the names and titles applied to Christ, in reply to my argument drawn from the attributes of Christ, and lastly in reply to my argument on the two natures. Parts of it have been thrown out in answer to others of my arguments.

The substance of the whole is, Christ was a man, and therefore was not God. This has been several times explained by me, but it shall now receive a thorough review, and probably a final one, so far as I am concerned.

I will draw out his several points even more distinct than he made them, that the audience may see that I meet them.

I will classify his several points.

I. He declaimed over the absurdity of my views and treated them as self-contradictory and impossible.

This is a departure from the established rules of controversy.

It is mere assertion. There is no more contradiction in saying that Christ was God and man, than there is in saying that a man is both matter and spirit, material and immaterial, visible and invisible.

To prove the thing a contradiction is impossible, and mere assertions are not to be taken as proof in controversy.

II. He affirmed that it involved the destruction of the balance of power in the Godhead. If the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are equal, and the Son took human nature, he must then be more than equal to either the Father or the Holy Ghost.

1. Humanity can add nothing to divinity; to any one attribute of divinity. On this ground alone the objection must fall.

2. As all three are equally infinite, as the Son or Logos was infinite before becoming incarnate, to say, as my friend does, that humanity added to it, is to say that it made it more than infinite. He must then give up his objection, or admit that a being can be more than infinite—that there is a degree and a measure beyond infinity.

III. It was urged that my views destroy the benevolence of the plan of redemption.

It was asked where was the love of God, in

the first, second or third person of the Trinity? The answer is, the love was the love of God; it was in all three, but particularly is it declared of the Father and the Son.

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John iii. 16.

"I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Gal. ii. 20.

"And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour." Eph. v. 2.

The love of the Father and the Son are here declared. But deny the atonement, as my friend does, and the love of the Father is turned into cruelty, in giving Christ to die, when there was no necessity for it. And Christ no more loved us and gave himself for us, than Paul or Peter did.

My friend asks where the love was. I answer:

"Here the whole Deity is known—
Nor dares a creature guess,
Which of the glories brightest shone,
The justice or the grace :"

IV. It was affirmed that the doctrine of the two natures of Christ, involves the absurdity of Christ's having two minds. The fact must follow that he had a human mind and a divine mind; but that only amounts to the fact of his two natures, the questions in debate. To be God and man, is to have a divine and human mind, but in no other sense does it suppose two minds in Christ. This makes the objection stand thus. Christ did not possess two natures, because it would involve the absurdity of having two natures. Or Christ cannot have possessed two minds, divine, and human, because it would involve the absurdity of having two minds. But this disproves nothing.

V. It was affirmed that the two natures of Christ, involves the absurdity of two natures in one essence.

This is a mere erroneous statement. There is at least a divine and human essence. We

do not affirm that Christ as divine and human was but one essence.

VI. It was affirmed that my view impeaches the veracity of Christ. I will quote the proof.

"Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also, that God was his Father, making himself equal with God. Then answered Jesus, and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." John v. 18, 19, 30.

"Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father, that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake." John xiv. 10, 11.

These texts present the strong ground of the objection.

Let us now examine the language of these texts.

1. I will not attempt to explain away the obvious sense of the language, as Mr. May does when a text appears against him. I understand the language in its most natural sense.

2. There are two points asserted in the language of Christ.

One is that he can do nothing of himself, that the Father that dwelleth in him doeth the works.

The second point is, his union and equality with the Father. This is just as clearly and positively stated as the other.

The Jews accused him of making himself equal with God. On what did they ground this charge.

On these words alone.

"But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." Verse 17.

Now the question is, did he say anything to put a different construction upon these words? He explained the manner, but retracted nothing.

"My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," is the ground of the charge. The defence is,

"The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do : for whatsoever he doeth, thcse also doeth the Son."

There is in the defense even more to produce an impression of equality than there was in the words first uttered. He even goes much further and declares :

"Marvel not at this : for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice. And shall come forth : they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

The two points being settled that Christ asserted that he could do nothing of himself, and that he was in union with and equal to the Father ; I have only to reconcile these two truths, the one with the other.

3. The explanation is, such is the union between him and the Father, that he can do nothing independently or separate from the Father. His whole work in this world was an official work as Messiah, to which he was appointed by the Father, and of course he did nothing without the Father. How could he do anything without the Father, or of himself, when he affirms that the Father sent him and that he is in the Father and the Father in him ? Such is the union that he could not act independently of the Father, for his divine nature exists with the Father in the unity of the Godhead.

The fact that the Father sent him as Messiah, to do an official work, is no proof that he did not exist with the Holy Ghost in the unity of the Godhead.

If he could have done any thing of himself, that is without the concurrence or appointment of the Father, it would prove the doctrine of the Trinity false. How terribly at fault is my friend's logic, when he argues that Christ was not God in unity of the Godhead, because he could do nothing of himself, or independently of the Father, whereas, if he could do any thing without the Father, the unity of the Godhead would be broken.

Thus do I make these texts wholly true, I have no occasion to explain away any part of the sense, as my friend is compelled to do. I make it literally true that Christ could do nothing of himself, but only act in union with the

Father, for he was "in the Father and the Father in him ;" and thus do I save my Lord from the terrible impeachment which my friend has brought against him, upon the supposition that he was anything more than a man.

VII. It was affirmed that my view involves deception on the part of Christ. This was mainly based upon one text.

But of that day and *that* hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Mark xiii. 32.

It is clear that my opponent relies more upon this text than any other, from the frequency of his quoting it, and the earnestness with which he has urged it. Let us examine it.

1. I might adopt his method and dispute the genuineness of the clause, "nor the Son." The ground for this is, it is not found in the parallel texts in Matt. or Luke, where the same words are intended to be recorded by two other writers, and Ambrose says it was wanting in this text in some Greek copies in his time. But I do not, I will not urge this ; I make no attack on the genuineness of the text.

2. I might dispose of it by a criticism, after the fashion of my friend, by contending that the verb knoweth, is sometimes used in the sense of to make known, as in 1 Cor. ii : 2. "For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified."

This would make the text assert that no man, nor angel, nor the Son would make known that day, but the Father only would make that known. But I will not even adopt this method for which I might quote some of the best Greek scholars.

3. I will understand the text to mean just what it says, and abide its most obvious sense.

I explain it in the light of the doctrine of the two natures of Christ. My opponent charged upon that doctrine, this consequence, that it implied that Christ had two minds. This is just the thing. He had a human mind, and a divine mind. Now as that human mind could be sorrowful and suffer without involving the divine mind in suffering, so the human mind could be ignorant of some things, without involving the divine mind in ignorance. The human mind being finite, like all other created

minds, could not know all that the divine mind knew, which was infinite.

Jesus Christ acting in his official capacity ■ the Messiah, was our prophet, and as a prophet he acted through his human nature, which was anointed and filled with the Holy Ghost, for the work of a prophet. Just those things were communicated to the human nature, as our prophet, which it was the will of the Father should be re-created to the world, but the precise day and hour when Jerusalem was to be destroyed, or when this world shall end, God has never seen fit to make known. As a prophet therefore, Christ did not know, because the revelations of divinity to him as prophet, did not include that, as it was not among the things ever to be revealed.

Christ was exercising his prophetic office and gifts as peculiar to his official appointment, when the question was asked. He was foretelling what was to come to pass, and with an eye on the prophetic gift, he was exercising, the inquiry was made, and it included one item never to be made known to men, viz : when the world should end, and his humanity anointed to the prophetic office, did not know.

But did he not deceive the people ? It is charged that he did. This is unfounded for three reasons.

1. He answered the real question asked." "Tell us, when shall these things be?" Verse 4.

2 The answer was strictly true. It was not only what had not been committed to the man Christ Jesus, ■ the world's prophet, but what the council of God had determined should not be made known. It is yet hid in the eternal mind.

3. He answered the question in the same capacity in which those who asked it contemplated him. They did not ask him as God, their dark minds did not yet contemplate him ■ God, they were full of errors, and not only did not understand the prophets, but failed to comprehend his plainest instructions.

" For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill him ; and after that he is killed, he shall rise the third day. But they understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask him." Mark ix. 31, 32.

Did he deceive them ?

" Then he took *unto him* the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished. For he shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on : And they shall scourge *him*, and put him to death : and the third day he shall rise again. And they understood none of these things : and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken." Luke xviii. 31-34.

Was it a deception to hide these things from them ?

Listen to his rebuke of their ignorance and unbelief long after this, even after his resurrection.

" Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken ! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory ? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." Luke xxiv. 25-27.

Were they all this time deceived by him ? They must have been upon the principle upon which my brother charges him with deception. They did not, and probably at this time, they could not comprehend the matter of the divine and human natures, and had the Evangelists written their gospels at this time, no reliance could have been placed upon them. But afterwards, and before they wrote, they were enlightened with the spirit of inspiration.

After his resurrection it is said :

" Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures." Luke xxiv. 45.

Again he made them this promise :

" But the Comforter, *which is* the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John xiv. 26.

This covers the whole ground of the inspiration of the apostles, and proves that though they did not understand the teachings of Christ at the time, what he taught was brought back to their recollection, and the sense he taught was revealed to their understandings by the Holy Ghost

There was then no deception, for they asked a question, and he answered the question they asked, and his answer was the true one. They asked him as a prophet, probably without any reference to or conception of his divine nature, and he answered them in perfect accordance with their conceptions of him and the question they asked, which precludes the possibility of deception. The answer made no false impression on their minds, all that can be pretended is that it left them ignorant of many important things not comprehended in the question, and if this constitutes deception, he deceived them and kept them deceived during the whole period of his ministry.

This view shows the absurdity of his illustration borrowed from Newton and others. Suppose Newton to have been the world's appointed astronomer, as Christ was the world's appointed prophet, and the people had no other conception of him but as an astronomer, and they had asked him an astronomical question, and he had answered it just in accordance with the fact, would he have deceived them because he did not tell them that there was more of him than they saw, that he had in what they saw of him, a soul, a spiritual essence which they could not see and comprehend? Surely not. No more then did Christ deceive, when he answered, because, he did not tell them at that time, that he was God and knew all things as God.

VIII. It was insisted that Christ disclaimed divine attributes. The text just examined was relied upon to prove this, that he disclaimed omniscience. It had no reference to the subject. It was an answer to a question and the question itself did not comprehend the fact of his divinity or of his omniscience but was addressed to him as a prophet, and so answered.

The texts in which Christ affirmed he could do nothing of himself, was relied upon to prove that he disclaimed divine attributes. This has been answered under the head of the supposed impeachment of his veracity. He could do nothing of himself, because, As the Father was in him so was he in the Father. It was shown that if he could do any thing without the Father, it would destroy the unity of the Godhead for which I contend.

IX. It was urged that the doctrine of the

two natures of Christ detracts from his piety, especially his submission and humility. Directly the reverse is the fact, as I will show you from a single quotation.

"Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name :" Phil. ii. 5-9.

If Christ was but a man, as my friend affirms, never was humanity so highly rewarded for the same amount of service.

Paul and Peter labored longer and suffered more upon my friend's theory.

Christ never got below the level of human nature. Wherein did he humble himself more than Paul or Peter if he was only a man? Christ labored about three years, Paul and Peter about forty. Christ was crucified and died the same day. Peter was crucified head downwards.

Christ was exalted above all principalities and powers, and received a name that is above every name.

"That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth. And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. ii. 10, 11.

All this for three years labor, and one death; while Paul and Peter for forty years labor and one death each, hoped only to be admitted to the presence of Christ to see his glory, and join with others to sing his praise. Such is the absurdity of my friend's theory; it makes the piety, submission, benevolence and self-denial of Christ turn pale before Paul and Peter, he suffering and doing infinitely less than they, and being exalted infinitely higher than they.

But admit, as my doctrine affirms, that he had glory with the Father before the world was, and that he left it and came to earth, and that his sufferings were of a redeeming charac-

ter, and that he suffered for all men, and suffered more than any mere human being ever did, ever will, or ever can suffer, and the whole is plain, and the crowning of him by the Father, and the rapturous songs of redeemed millions that throw their living echo forever around his throne, are but the reward of his redeeming work, and triumph over sin, death and hell.

"Alone the dreadful race he ran,
Alone the wine-press trod;
He dies and suffers as a man,
He rises as a God.

He rises, who mankind has bought,
With grief and pain extreme:
'Twas great to speak the world from nought;
'Twas greater to redeem."

I have one text more.

"For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." 2 Cor. viii. 9.

X. It was urged that my theory supposes that many texts do not mean what they say.

This must be the stone of Proverbs, xxvi. 27. "Whoso diggeth a pit shall fall therein; and he that rolleth a stone, it will return upon him."

I take it for granted that every text means what it says, and have in this whole discussion. I have not attempted to explain away a single text. But my friend has done but little else but to labor to show that the texts do not mean what they say. Take two texts as an example.

"Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am." John viii. 58.

"And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." John xvii. 5.

You will all remember the labored effort he made to prove that these passages do not mean what they say.

MR. MAY'S FIRST SPEECH.

Mr. Lee has, three or four times during our discussion, charged me with explaining away passages of Scripture that obviously stood opposed to the position I am endeavoring to maintain. I ask him, sir, if he means to intimate that I do this in any unfair way. I demand of him to say whether he doubts that I sincerely

believe the expositions I give to be more nearly correct than any others would be?

Mr. Lee—No more than you charge me with unfairness when you allege that I have not explained a passage properly.

Mr. chairman, our methods and principles of interpretation are widely different. Which is the better of the two, you and our auditors must judge for yourselves. The style of our Sacred Scriptures is eminently figurative. We must explain a great many passages one way or another. Our Saviour calls himself at one time a "shepherd," at another "the Lamb," and then again, "the door of the sheepfold." Now he cannot be all three, nor either one, literally. Which is he? and in what sense is he that? So, too, he calls himself the "true vine," and then, "the rock," and again, "the bread that came down from heaven." Now, sir, does not Mr. Lee explain away the literal meaning of such expressions as much as I do? and if his exposition differs from mine, who shall say which is the better of the two?

In answer to my argument, that our Saviour's disclaimer of divine attributes is a complete overthrow of all the texts he piled up in proof, that Christ did possess them, Mr. Lee said just now, that Jesus answered those questions in the character in which he was contemplated by those who addressed him; and that was as a prophet and not as a divine being. Sir, does he mean that Christ came into the world to teach men only what he might be called to teach them by their leading questions? and to speak and act towards them only in the character which they might affix to him? Did he not come to declare to them truths which would make them wise unto salvation? Now, my brother believes that the doctrine of the deity of Christ, aye, of the trinity of the Godhead, is the fundamental one. How then can he account for it, that Jesus not only failed to teach that, but that he should say what was adapted to lead his hearers to believe the opposite? Jesus said in so many words, "I can of mine own self do nothing;" "All power is given to me by my Father;" "Of that day and that hour I know not;" "Why callest thou me good," &c. Sir, what can we understand from all this but that he was not the Almighty, the omniscient God? But I turn to the subject of his main argument last evening.

The doctrine of two natures in Christ is deemed by Mr. Lee, and all Trinitarians, so indispensable to the support of their system—and it

seems to me so fatal to their system that we must both of us be excused for dwelling upon it longer. In one sense, sir, all Unitarians believe, and ever have believed, in the Divine nature of Christ. That is, we believe his mission was divine—that he spoke and acted by divine authority—that he possessed a god-like temper and god-like powers—that the Father was with him and in him; in this sense, sir, we all believe the divinity of Christ, or his divine nature.

That we believe in his human nature, my friend Lee does not doubt. We believe, or rather let me say, I believe that Jesus of Nazareth was a man, the son of a man and a woman, that he had the physical conformation and bodily members of a man; that he had the feelings and affections, the appetites and passions, the wants and infirmities of a man. I believe that he was tempted in all respects as other men are tempted; but, I believe that all the lower parts of his nature were so subjected, the human was so subordinated to the divine, in him, that he did not yield to his temptations; sin had no dominion over him; he cast its allurements behind him, and trod them under his feet. I believe the Holy Spirit, which strives with all of us to will and to do of God's good pleasure, was triumphant in him over every tendency to evil; it was enthroned in his soul. God dwelt in him, just as he promises us all, that if we will keep his words, the Father and himself will come and make their abode with us. He was at-one with God, as he would have us at-one with himself and the Father. I believe that Jesus was a perfect man—the only perfect one who ever lived; not, I hope, the only perfect one that ever will live, for the high calling of God to us all, is to become "holy as Christ was holy in all manner of conversation." That call would not have been made to us, if there were no power in us to hear and obey it. And I trust, when the din and jargon of unintelligible theologies shall be hushed, and the voice of God speaking through Christ shall be permitted to come to the ears and hearts of men, I trust there will be many who will gladly hear the gospel call, and become beloved sons of God.

But I am getting away from the subject immediately before us this evening—the two natures of Christ. I have told you, sir, and my brother Lee, what *my* belief is; now may I ask him to answer a few questions that I may, if possible, understand his doctrine, and not do it injustice in my reply. I shall not be as peremptory with him as he was with me the other even-

ing; but if he will answer my questions I think we shall come to a better understanding of the points at issue.

Do you, my friend, when you speak of the human nature of Christ, comprehend in your idea the material body of Jesus of Nazareth—the body that in infancy was cradled in the arms of Mary, and in its maturity was stretched upon the cross, and then laid in the tomb?

Mr. Lee—I do; in the same sense that the body of my friend there, Elder Palmer, is the same body that was born of his mother.

Mr. May—I understood you to say, the other evening, that the Holy Ghost conceived the human nature of Jesus. Do you retain that opinion?

Mr. Lee—That was not my position. I believe that Mary conceived the child and not the Holy Ghost.

Mr. May—if you do, then what was the office performed by the Virgin Mary? In what sense was she the mother of Jesus?

Mr. Lee—The same office that is performed by any other mother.

Mr. May—if you believe that Mary conceived the body, then let me ask what part the Holy Ghost performed in the conception of the Son?

Mr. Lee—it supplied the place of a human father.

Mr. May—Your creed says Christ was begotten by the Father and *conceived* by the Holy Ghost. At the conception of the body of the human child, was the whole second person of the Trinity conceived in that child instead of his soul, or in addition to his soul?

Mr. Lee—I never affirmed that she conceived the Divine nature. My view is, the conception was of entire humanity, body, soul and spirit, if you make such a distinction.

Mr. May—Let me ask, if you believe the human body and soul of the man Christ Jesus are still existing in an inseparable union with the second person of the Trinity, as I understood the creed of the Episcopal Church to declare; or do you believe that they are now existing apart from the Godhead, or that they were annihilated at the moment of Christ's ascension?

Mr. Lee—They exist in union now as they did on earth, or as our bodies shall exist in heaven when they shall be raised and glorified.

Mr. May—if Christ was a being having a human body, and the second person of the Trinity (which, according to your proposition, comprised the whole Godhead,) for his soul, then how do you escape the conclusion that it was the

Godhead that suffered the anguish in Gethsemane, and the mortal agony of the cross, and so punished himself for the sins of men?

Mr Lee—I do not say he had the Godhead for his soul. But that a human body and soul was united to the Divinity. Perfect divinity cannot suffer. Suffering implies imperfection.

Mr. May—Your ideas are beyond my comprehension.

Mr. Lee replied—That is not my fault.

Mr. May—if, however, you believe that Jesus Christ possessed a human soul, and it was that alone which suffered in the dissolution that took place on the cross, then how do you find in the death of Christ an infinite satisfaction or atonement for the sins of mankind?

Mr. Lee—The union of the humanity with the Divinity gave it its value.

Mr. May—Once more, if I have understood what you have said in the course of our discussion, what is stated in the creed of your church and much more plainly stated in the creeds of the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches, then Christ was begotten by the Father and conceived by the Holy Ghost: that is to say, he was the Son of both, the first person being his father, the third person his mother, (for that is the import of the word conceived,) what then am I to understand by your saying, that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son: that is to say, that the mother proceeded, in part, from her offspring?

Mr. Lee—I cannot get at the point of your question, it is so complicated in its statement. Mr. May then re-stated and Mr. Lee said—I am not responsible for the creeds, nor am I bound to defend them. They are not up for discussion.

Mr. May said—But you know that I wanted to discuss the creeds at the first.

Mr. Lee replied—Then why did you not consent to discuss the second and fourth articles of my creed, after proposing them yourself?

Mr. May—Because you was anxious to have the question as explicit as possible, and I yielded to your judgment.

Mr. Lee—You should have known better than to trust such a man as I am.

M. Again, if the Father begot the Son, and the Holy Ghost conceived him in the womb of the Virgin Mary, then may I ask what the creeds mean where they say that the Son "took upon himself man's nature"? Can language speak of any thing more passive than a being who is begotten by one person and conceived by another person? And yet to ~~s~~ being so described, you and your creeds attribute the activity of coming down from Heaven and incarnating himself. There certainly seems to me to be inconsistency and contradiction in these statements somewhere. Will you show me, if there be not any?

L. You misunderstand the creed and the difficulty grows out of your misapprehension.

Mr. May said—if Christ was begotten by the Holy Ghost then in what sense was he the Son of God?

Mr. Lee answered—in what sense is any Christian, a Child of Grace a Son of God who is begotten by the Holy Ghost?

Lastly, Do you believe that on the day when Jesus was born, he was already the Christ, the dearly beloved Son of God, the Second person of the Trinity, possessed of all the attributes of God? If not, when did he become all this?

L. He was the prospective Christ, but was not yet anointed as the word Christ signifies anointed. The divinity was there when he was born.

M. If you believe he was born God all mighty, all wise and all good, then please tell me, how he could have increased in wisdom and in favor with God as Luke (Chap. ii. 52) tells us he did? And what is meant by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him at his baptism?

L. That relates to his humanity exclusively. In accordance with my friend's system of doctrines, it seems to be impossible to answer these questions in either way without contradicting one or another part of the system, and showing how unstable it is.

I wish now to occupy what time remains in examining a few more passages quoted by Mr. Lee in support of his doctrine of the two natures of Christ, and one or two assumptions made by him in the course of his argument.

After what I have said, in explanation of several kindred passages, I need not spend much time upon the 16 John 28, 29, verses, "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world, and go to the Father. His disciples said unto him, Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb.

My friend is misled as to the true meaning of this passage, by not attending to the particular force and genuine sense of words as they are used in Scripture. To "come into the world" as here used does not signify to come from any previous or prior state of existence, but it signifies to receive a commission from God, to

enter upon it, or appear amongst men in his name. The term world here is *kosmos*, which sometimes means the material fabric of the earth and sometimes means very much the same that *aion* means, that is, men united in society.

To come into the world therefore is to mix amongst men, or rather to commence a course of conduct, or an office in society, and enter upon a scene of public action.

That this is the true sense of these words in the passage we are considering, I think will be made very apparent to you by some examples. Thus our Lord says to Pilate, John xviii. 37, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world that I might bear witness to the truth." Here Jesus refers in the first place to his birth, implying that he was a man, and afterwards speaks of his divine commission, he "came into the world to bear witness to the truth." Mark ii. 17, "I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance." John viii. 47, "for I came not to judge the world but to save." In like manner 1 John iv. 1, "many false prophets are gone out into the world"; and 2 John verse 7, "many deceivers are entered into the world." No one of course ever imagined that these false teachers pre-existed in any former state, and yet a similar mode of speaking of them is used, to that which we are considering in reference to Christ. They are said to have gone out or entered into the world when they commenced their course of teaching whatever they may have been. And in a corresponding meaning of the opposite form of expression, our Lord the best and most excellent of all teachers was said to come into the world, when he entered upon his mission to instruct and save mankind.

But there is a passage which I am still more desirous you should consider, as it will satisfy you I think that I have given the true exposition of the passage Mr. Lee pressed upon us as one of his proofs of the pre-existence of Christ. It is the xvii. 18 of John, where our Saviour is praying to his Father for his disciples, he says "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." Here Christ himself declares that his apostles are sent into the world in the same manner "as the Father sent him into the world."

These remarks and references abundantly sustain me in giving you the following paraphrase of this passage xvi. 28, "I came forth from the Father"—that is, I was sanctified and endowed by him for the work I have commenced,

the redemption of mankind. "I came into the world," that is, I began the work which he gave to do, and have brought down upon me an opposition that will put an end to my personal ministry. *Again I leave the world—I retire from this scene of action, and go unto the Father*—that is, I withdraw from the world, and go to Him from whom I received this great commission.

I cannot, if I would, compel you to accept this exposition of this passage. I can only beg of you to consider the passage in the light I have thrown upon it, and see for yourselves whether or not, it be in accordance with the general scope of what the Scriptures declare respecting Christ.

My friend on the other side dwelt awhile upon the expression "sent into the world," and contended that Jesus must have been in another world or he could not have been sent into this world. The utter weakness of that argument is made apparent to any one who remembers in how many instances in the Old Testament the prophets of the Lord are said to have been sent by him, and sent from him to proclaim some truth, to utter some commandment, (Ex. iii. 13, 14–15,) to give some promise, or pronounce some condemnation. Isa. 48 16.

So too, Mr. Lee, argued that the expression he took upon him the seed of Abraham, and took upon him the form of a servant, implied that he must have had another and higher nature, upon which he took that nature or form of being in which he appeared as the redeemer of mankind.

He quoted Hebrews ii. 14, "For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same," implying that he was superior to such beings as are clothed in flesh "that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." 16 verse, "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham."

If you will observe, Mr. Chairman, the words in this 16 verse, *him the nature of* in our common version, are in italics, intimating that there is nothing corresponding to them in the original; why they were put in here, if the translators understood the meaning of the original, one cannot divine, unless it was to make another text that might be quoted in behalf of the doctrine we are discussing. Sir, the best commentators, Dr. Adam Clarke amongst them, concur in saying that *epilambanetai* the word

translated "took on him" means rather *to help to succor, to save from sinking*. It was not his mission to raise or save fallen or falling angels, but to redeem men from destruction and spiritual death. He was therefore adapted to this work. He was a man. He had been tempted in all points like as men are, and had himself been made perfect through suffering, showing that Jesus who is the sanctifier and they who may be sanctified by him are all one, the same kind of beings, so that he is not ashamed to call them brethren. Now, Sir, in the light of these few hints let me give a true translation of the verses under consideration, with a few that precede and a few that come after, that you may see how little support this passage gives to my friend's doctrine of the two natures, or of the pre-existence of Christ. I will begin with the 10th verse—"For it became him for whom are all things and by whom are all things in bringing many sons to glory to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church, will I sing praise unto thee. For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same. For verily he took not hold of angels to succor them, but he took hold to save the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it was befitting that he should be made like unto his brethren; that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered—being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted."

MR. LEE'S SECOND SPEECH.

I shall not now review the last positions taken by Mr. May, but proceed to my direct arguments. [The conclusion of the argument on the personality and deity of the Holy Ghost, which was delivered now, is found at the beginning of the first speech of this evening. Mr. Lee then proceeded with the following argument on the Trinity.—Reporter.]

"There is but one living and true God, everlasting, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity;—the Father, the Son, [the Word] and the Holy Ghost."

I. The doctrine of this article is a necessary consequence of the points already admitted or proved.

1. It is admitted that there is but one only living and true God.

2. It is admitted that the person called the Father in this article, is God in the fullest and highest sense.

3. It has been proved that the Son or Word is God, possessing all the names and titles, all the attributes, performing acts, and receiving all the worship which belong to the Father.

4. It has been proved that the Holy Ghost is God, possessing the name and attributes of God.

From these points thus admitted or proved, it follows that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost exist in the unity of the Godhead.

As it is clear that the three are God, it must follow that they exist in the unity of one Godhead, or that there are three Gods.

But it is admitted that there is but one God, therefore the three already proved to possess absolute divinity, must exist in the unity of the Godhead.

II. The doctrine under consideration receives additional support from an implied plurality in the Godhead, found in the Scriptures.

1. The very name God, *Elohim*, in the Hebrew, is admitted to be in the plural form.

Elohim is said to be the plural of *El*, or *Eloah*.

"*Elohim* is the same as *Eloah*; one being singular, the other plural. Nevertheless *Elohim* is generally construed in the singular, particularly when the true God is spoken of; when false gods are spoken of it is rather construed in the plural."—Robinson's *Calmet*; word *Eloah*.

"The name of God occurs frequently in both the singular and plural, but never in the dual."—Roy, word *Elohim*.

Gesenius admits the word to be plural and refers to Gen. xx. 13. "God caused me to wander," he renders it, "the Gods caused me to wander."

"Let those who have any doubt, whether *Elohim*, when applied to the true God, Jehovah, be plural or not, consult the following passages where they will find it joined with adjectives, verbs and pronouns plural."—Parkhurst.

The author gives nearly 30 texts. Among them are Gen. i. 26; iii. 22; xi. 7; xx. 13; xxxi. 7, 53, xxxv. 7.

This fact is alluded to in the following comment on the sixth section of Leviticus, by Rabbi Simeon or Solomon ben Joachi, "Come and see the mystery of the word Elohim; there are three degrees, and each degree by itself alone, and yet notwithstanding they are all one, and are not divided from each other."

I have not the original of this, but find it quoted by Dr. Clarke in his note on Gen. i. 1. I also find it quoted in Roy's Hebrew and English Dictionary. Word Elohim.

2. There are several texts in which the name of God is connected with plural pronouns.

"God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Gen. i. 26.

Here are two plural pronouns, and one of them repeated. Let us make—in our image—after our likeness.

To whom did God speak?

Not to angels for several reasons.

(1.) Man was to be made after the image and likeness of the speaker and the spoken to. Our likeness and our image, implies that the speaker and the spoken were of one essence, presenting one likeness and image. If God addressed angels, in whose image was man made? In the image of God, or in the image of angels?

That he was made in the image of the Creator is clearly proved.

"For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God :" 1 Cor. xi. 7.

"Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds ; And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." Col. iii. 9, 10.

"And be renewed in the spirit of your mind ; And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Eph. iv. 23, 24.

"Therewith bless we God, even the Father ; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God." James iii. 9.

These texts prove that it was after the image of God that man was created.

(2.) There is not the slightest evidence that the angels had any thing to do with creating

man, or anything else. No allusion is found to any such idea, in all the Scriptures.

"And the Lord God said behold the man has become as one of us to know good and evil." Gen. iii. 23.

"Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech." Gen. xi. 7.

3. The Scriptures often distinctly refer to the three persons in the Godhead, and associate them as equal, in the solemn transactions in which God is concerned.

"In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphims : each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts ; the whole earth is full of his glory. Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us ? Then said I, Here am I ; send me." Isa. vi. 1, 2, 3, 8.

Here the prophet saw the Lord. It has been shown that the Lord here seen was Jesus Christ.

The seraphims cried one to another, holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts. This may be significant of the three persons in the Godhead.

The prophet then heard the voice of the Lord, saying, "whom shall I send, and who will go for us." Here is a plurality of persons for whom the prophet went.

But the prophet went for the "one living and true God;" there is therefore, a plurality of persons in the Godhead.

"Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read ; no one of these shall fail, none shall want her mate : for my mouth it hath commanded, and his Spirit it hath gathered them." Isa. xxxiv. 16.

Here are three personalities, the speaker, my mouth hath commanded.

The second person is represented by the pronoun his, in the possessive case.

The third person is the Spirit, "his spirit, it hath gathered them."

"Come ye near unto me, hear ye this ; I have not spoken in secret from the beginning ; from the time that it was, there am I : and

now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me. Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; *I am* the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by *by* the way *that* thou shouldest go. Oh that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea." Isaiah xlvi.ii. 16-18.

Here are the speaker, the Lord God, and his Spirit, making three. God and his Spirit are clear. The Speaker may be the prophet, Cyrus, or the Messiah.

" Yet now be strong, O Zerubbabel, saith the Lord; and be strong, O Joshua son of Josedech, the high priest; and be strong, all ye people of the land, saith the Lord, and work: for *I am* with you, saith the Lord of hosts: According to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you: fear ye not. For thus saith the Lord of hosts, Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; And I will shake all nations, and the Desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts." Haggai. ii. 4-7.

Here are three persons, the speaker, the Lord of hosts; His spirit that remained among them; and, the desire of all nations that was to come.

" And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and light upon him :" Matt. iii. 16.

Here we have a clear view of the three persons in the Godhead, the Son coming up from the water, the Holy Ghost lighting upon him, and the Father, speaking from heaven.

" How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb. ix. 16.

Here is the whole Trinity concerned in the work of redemption.

God the Father to whom the offering is made. Jesus Christ, the sacrifice who offered himself to God.

The eternal Spirit, through whom the offering was made.

" Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost :" Matt. xxviii. 19.

Baptism is a most solemn act of Christian worship, and it is performed in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

Baptism is also a most solemn act of consecration to God.

MR. MAY'S SECOND SPEECH.

To-morrow evening, Sir, I shall devote myself to an examination of Mr. Lee's argument, in support of the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost. This evening I must dispose of another subject, introduced by my friend's inquiry, whether I believed Jesus to be the Son of Joseph as well as of Mary. My reply will exhibit, to some extent, the method, which I think ought to be pursued, in the investigation of any important doctrine, alleged to be taught in the Bible.

I know not of any so complete and yet so concise description of the Bible, as that given by Edmund Burke. "The Bible," said he, "is no one summary of doctrine regularly digested, in which a man could not mistake his way; it is a most venerable, but most multifarious collection of the records of Divine Economy,—a collection of an infinite variety; of cosmogony, theology, legislation, ethics, carried through different books by different authors, at different ages, for different ends and purposes. It is necessary to sort out what was intended for example; what only as narrative; what to be understood figuratively, and what literally; where one precept is to be controlled and modified by another; what is used directly, and what only as an *argumentum ad hominem*; what is temporary, and what of perpetual obligation; what appropriated to our state and set of men, and what the general duty of all men in all ages."

It is one thing, Sir, to search over its pages to find texts which may give countenance or support to one's pre-conceived opinions; and quite another thing to study the Bible in order to find out what is really taught in it. That one may become thoroughly acquainted with the contents of this invaluable volume, he must acquire the languages, in which the different parts of it were originally written; he must get access to the most accurate copies of the

Hebrew and Greek Testaments ; and be possessed of much knowledge of the manners, customs, theological opinions, and usages of speech, peculiar to the different ages, and nations, in which the different writers of those Scriptures lived, and for whom they wrote. But any individual, who has good sense, and a sufficient amount of fidelity and patience, may learn from our common English Translation alone, though it was made nearly a hundred and fifty years ago, since which time the meanings of many English words have undergone considerable changes,—I say, such a person from this translation alone may learn, not only all that is essential to salvation, but enough of true theology to enable him to reject many of the greatest errors, that have been fastened, for more than a thousand years, upon the faith of Christendom.

Since the invention of printing, the sacred Scriptures have been transferred from a few manuscript copies, to printed editions almost numerous enough to put a copy into every family, if not into the hand of every individual of every Protestant country, in his own language. This has every where changed more or less, the theological opinions of men. And when the restrictions, that have been put upon the study of the Bible by Protestant Churches, are thrown down, and the people are left just as free to study the volume of revelation, as they are to study the volume of nature, there will be a much greater uniformity of opinion than now exists among Protestant sects ; and a much more general and farther departure from the theology of the Dark Ages.

My friend on the other side has repeatedly, in the course of this discussion, charged me with treating the Bible disrespectfully ; rejecting its authority ; and deducing from its pages doctrines, which he considers fearfully wrong. Whether this charge be a just one, you who have heard what I said, must judge for yourselves, as you will be the better able to do, after you shall have carefully read the printed report of this discussion. For my part, I cannot conceive how any man can do a greater injury to the Bible, than by making it responsible for that theological system, no where stated on its own pages, which represents God as the inexorable tyrant of the universe, Christ as a complex being, so strangely compounded that we cannot know, when to regard him as a man, contending gloriously with the temptations and

trials of a life on earth, the object at one time of the deepest sympathy and at another of the warmest admiration ; and when as the infinite God beyond the reach of suffering, and claiming only the worship of all :—a system, moreover, which represents the condition of the human race to be such, that to very much the larger part of mankind, in all ages past and present, the gift of existence shall prove to be an everlasting curse. I repeat it, Sir, that for my part, I cannot imagine how a man can show greater disrespect to the Bible than to make it responsible for that system of doctrines which rests upon the doctrine of the Trinity as its basis.

But I did not intend to trouble you, Sir, with so much in reply to what Mr. Lee has said, at sundry times and in diverse manners, of my use of the Bible.

You remember, Sir, that my friend the other evening, demanded, in a very peremptory tone, whether I believed that Jesus was the son of Joseph as well as Mary. Perhaps he foresaw, that my answer to that question would shock most of our auditors, and prejudice them against me and all else, that I might have to say in the course of this discussion. But any one, Sir, who will study the Bible instead of merely collating texts to prove his cherished opinions, will find in it a great deal to justify the belief, that Jesus, according to the flesh, was the Son of Joseph.

First. If we accept the vii. of Isaiah 14 verse, there is no passage in the whole Old Testament that would suggest the expectation that the birth of the Messiah would in any wise be miraculous. On the contrary, all the prophecies and promises are so expressed, that they would lead the reader to expect, that the long-promised deliverer would be a man, a natural and legitimate descendant of Abraham, and of the particular lineage of David. Turn to Deut. xviii. 15. Moses there says to the People of Israel, “The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy brethren like unto me ; unto him ye shall hearken.” And in the 18 verse he tells them the Lord said unto me, “I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth ; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command them.” Surely by such language the people must have been led to expect that their Messiah was to be a man conceived and born in the same way as other men, who should be one of the brethren

of the children of Abraham, as much so as their great leader Moses was. And when God swore unto David, "that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit upon his throne," (Acts ii. 30, referring no doubt to 2 Sam. vii. 12,) what else could have been understood, but that Christ was to be a man, born in the regular line of descent from David. He is elsewhere often spoken of as the Son of David, of the tribe of Judah, &c.

Now, Sir, Christ could not be heir to the throne of David, unless he had a lineal descendant of David for his *father*; because females did not inherit amongst the Jews. This is well understood by all the commentators. Dr. Whitby, on whom Dr. Adam Clarke bestows this commendation—"Whitby is learned, argumentative and thoroughly orthodox;" Dr Whitby says, "It was necessary that the genealogy of Jesus should be declared from Joseph, * * * because if Joseph had not been acknowledged to have been of the tribe of Judah, and of the family of David, they (the Jews) would not have failed to have objected this as a just prejudice against all Christ's pretences to have been the Messiah; wherefore (he adds) the Divine Wisdom was pleased to direct this Apostle to remove that stumbling block." Here you see, this thoroughly orthodox commentator admits, that it would have been an insuperable objection to Christ's claims, if it had appeared, that he was not a descendant of David. He admits also that genealogies were reckoned in the male line only. To say therefore, as my opponent does, that Joseph was not his father according to the flesh, is to make these genealogies a mere cover to conceal the real fact from the Jews, who were expecting a deliverer that would be Son of David. But there is no appearance of its being a device, to answer a purpose for a season. The genealogies were evidently intended to prove that Jesus was of the seed of Abraham, and of the family of David. That which is given by Matthew begins no farther back than Abraham; and brings down the line of succession to "Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ." The genealogy given in Luke traces the descent of Christ up through Joseph to David, Abraham and Adam. But unless Joseph was the father of Jesus, these genealogies do not help to establish Christ's claim to the Messiahship. The expression used in Luke, "being as was supposed the Son of Joseph," need not throw any doubt upon the fact, that he was the Son of

Joseph. They only declare what was generally believed. So, too, the expression in Matthew— "Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus." Although, I confess, both the clauses seem to have been introduced, by way of accommodation to the account of the miraculous conception. But plainly enough, if Jesus was not really the Son of Joseph, but one miraculously born of Mary, without the intervention of a father, if this were true, then I say the genealogies are quite useless. Either the genealogies must be given up, as proving nothing, not pertinent, or the account of the miraculous conception must be relinquished as one of the many apocryphal stories, which were circulated in the primitive age of the church, most of which were rejected by the framers of our present canon of Scripture, and specimens of which may be found in a volume entitled the Apocryphal New Testament.

Suppose then, that Mr. Lee, concludes to abandon the genealogies as proving nothing, but that the *reputed* father of Jesus was of the lineage of David.

I will ask him to come with me again to the examination of Matt. i. 22, 23, which he no doubt considers an irrefragable proof that Jesus was born of a virgin, according to a divine prophecy. "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son." Turn to the passage, Sir, as it stands in Isaiah vii. 14, and you will find it difficult to discover any reference to a miraculous conception, or to any very future event. That the words as they there stand related to the birth of a child about to take place during the life of Ahaz, is evident enough from the context. For in verse 16, it is said, "Before the child shall know how to refuse the evil or check the good," a desirable event was to take place. But there would have been no propriety in saying this of a child, not to be born until more than seven centuries after that event. That the prediction was accomplished, that such a child was born in that age, cannot be denied; but that a miraculous conception took place then, no one pretends to believe. And the Hebrew word translated *virgin* does not necessarily mean an unmarried woman, but may mean also a young married woman. Bishop Lowth affirms the obvious and literal meaning to be, "That within the time, that a young woman, now a virgin, should conceive and bring forth a child, and that child

should arrive at such an age as to distinguish between good and evil, that is within a few years, the enemies of Judah should be destroyed." To that child in the days of Ahaz, so designated by the prophet, the name of Immanuel was given, in accordance with the custom of the Hebrews. It signified that God would be with them, and before long, deliver them out of their trouble. The birth of Jesus, which did not take place until more than seven hundred years after that prediction, could not be to Ahaz and his people a sign of the deliverance they were longing for. Hence there are many, who, notwithstanding the index which our translators have put at the head of the chapter, conclude that the words of the prophet had no relation to the birth of Christ. And when it is observed that in Matt. ii. 15 the words (Hoshea xi. 1) "out of Egypt have I called my son," and in the 18 verse the words (Jere. xxxi. 15) "In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation and weeping," &c., are quoted as prophetic, though as they are found in their original places in the Old Testament there is obviously nothing prophetic in their character—I say, Sir, when this is observed, a careful student of the Bible may be led to suppose that the passage (*Isa. viii. 14*) may have been quoted by Math. in *Chap. i.* 22, 23 in the same spirit of accommodation, as the passages in the second chapter, 15 and 18, were unquestionably used.

Then, Sir, how will my opponent dispose of the fact that Christ calls himself and is called by others a *man* forty times, and "the son of man" upwards of eighty times? If he had not had a human father how was he the son of man? Adam is never called the son of man, for he had no earthly parents, but "the Son of God." *Luke iii. 38.* It seems to me, Sir, natural to conclude that, as Jesus, the true and faithful witness so often called himself, so he really was the son of man.

Then Sir, let me through you, ask my friend to consider, what was the general opinion of the people of his age respecting Jesus; the opinion of his relatives, his neighbors, his countrymen; where can he show me evidence that they regarded him as any other than a man, the Son of Joseph. *Luke ii. 48.* In the account of what happened when he was about twelve years old on his return with his parents from Jerusalem, they fearing that he was lost from their company, went back in pursuit of him, and his mother said, "Thy father and I have

sought thee sorrowing." Here the mother of Jesus calls Joseph his father.

John i. 45. Philip says to Nathaniel, "We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph." This shows that the disciples supposed the person, of whom Moses and the prophets wrote, would have an earthly father, and that they believed Joseph to be the father of Jesus."

Luke iv. 22, "Is not this Joseph's son?" This shows that the people of Nazareth, where Jesus had been brought up, believed him to be Joseph's son.

John vi. 42, "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?"

And Math. xiii. 55, "Is not this the carpenter's son?"

These passages show that the Jews in general believed Jesus to be the Son of Joseph.

But, Sir, there is a more remarkable passage still, to the same effect. In the account which Luke gives of the miraculous conception, we read the angel said unto Mary, "Fear not, Mary, for thou has found favor with God. And behold! thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shall call his name Jesus. He shall be great and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give him the throne of his father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Here it was told Mary in the most explicit manner that her son was to be the Messiah, whom the Jews expected to sit on the throne of David, and assume over mankind a dominion that should never end; and it appears moreover from the words of Mary that she understood the angels as making this assertion.

Now, if such an occurrence actually took place, how are we to account for what is recorded. *Mark iii. 20-21,* "And the multitude came together again so that they could not so much as eat bread. When his friends heard of it, they went out to lay hold of him; for they said he is beside himself." The friends here alluded to were his relations. They are spoken of again in the 31 verse of the same chapter — "his brethren and his mother." His mother then, it seems, thought that he was beside himself; that he was deranged; because poor and unlearned as he was, he did and said such things — implied that he was the Messiah, and yet pursued a course the very reverse of what the

Jews expected their Messiah would adopt. But, if she had really been informed by an angel as the account of the miraculous conception alleges, that her son was to be the Messiah, would she have had any doubts respecting him?

Then in addition to the above considerations, hear the direct testimony to the fact that he was the Son of Joseph. John i. 45 Philip says to Nathaniel, "We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, *the Son of Joseph.*" John v. 46, Jesus himself says, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me." Now what Moses wrote I have already quoted, that God would raise up unto them a prophet like unto himself. And elsewhere, you remember he is often called a prophet. John vi. 14, vii. 40-42; Luke xiii. 33, xxiv 19; Acts iii. 22, vii. 37.

In Acts ii. 22, Jesus of Nazareth is declared to have been "*a man* approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you. No allusion is made to the miraculous birth of Jesus in any of the discourses, or any of the Epistles of the Apostles. Not the slightest reference is made to that peculiarity of his birth by Mark or John, nor by the other evangelists excepting in the single passages where it is recorded. No appeal in behalf of his authority as a divine messenger is, in any part of the Bible, based upon his miraculous birth, but uniformly upon the wisdom of his teaching and the miraculous powers that he evinced. But on the contrary in Hebrews ii. 37 it was argued that "in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren." Would a believer in his miraculous conception use such language, without adding a word to remind the reader, that Christ was conceived in a manner unlike other men. But the writer to the Hebrews intimates nothing of the kind. If in all things Jesus was made like unto his brethren, is it not the natural inference, that he was conceived as they were? And this was, I suppose, the belief of the primitive church. The first converts to Christianity were made from amongst the Jews. They were called Nazarines and Ebionites. Some have alleged that these two classes of Christians differed on this very subject of the miraculous conception. But Dr. Priestly gives in his history of Early Opinions, vol. iv. p. 77, a good reason for believing that this was not the point of their disagreement, and he says,

without qualification, "It is well known that the Ebionites maintained that their copies of this (Matthew's) Gospel, which wanted the introduction, (containing the account of the miraculous conception,) was the genuine work of the Apostles." He gives Jerome as his authority for saying that the Gospel used by the Nazarines and Ebionites "was by most persons called the authentic gospel of Matthew."

I have now givep you, Sir, and this audience my reasons for believing that Jesus was the Son of Joseph as he was supposed to be; and that those parts of Matthew and Luke which tell of his miraculous conception, were interpolated at a very early day. In yielding as I have done my belief to the reasons now stated, I may have erred; but, Sir, I see not what inducement I can have to decide this question contrary to evidence. My opposition to the doctrine of the Trinity would not impel me to an unfair decision on this point, for Sir, even if the account of the miraculous conception be established — a veritable part of the history of Jesus, it would not help much if any to support the doctrine of his deity, for the same Evangelist (Luke) who gives the most particular account of the miracle wrought in the conception of Jesus, tells us also of miracles no less wonderful connected with the birth of John the Baptist. And if we turn back to the Old Testament, we read that Samson and Isaac were both miraculously conceived, and Melchisedec is said to have had neither father nor mother, and certainly Adam had not either, but was created directly by God — is called by Luke the Son of God, and yet no one believes that he was any more or less than a man.

But I have trespassed upon time, and must leave my argument to make what impression it may upon those who have heard it, and will be candid enough to examine it in the light of those Scriptures to which I have referred.

EIGHTH EVENING—MARCH 16.

MR. LEE'S FIRST SPEECH.

I wish to say that I have been extremely desirous to close this discussion the present week. There are various reasons for this, felt by many besides myself. With a view to such a result I desired to have prosecuted the discussion last evening, but Mr. May complained of hoarseness and I yielded, as in duty bound. I am still willing to close this week, and to accomplish such a desirable end, I am willing to continue the discussion to-morrow evening, and Saturday

evening, if my friend will consent. But if he insists on pushing it over into another week I shall go with him, for I am bound to continue until he shall be satisfied, or the people decline to come to hear us.

I had nearly finished my argument on the Trinity, which I will now complete, and commence a review.

The point under consideration was the topic of Baptism. I said just at closing—Baptism is a most solemn act of Christian worship, and it is performed in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

Baptism is also a most solemn act of consecration to God.

It is the naming of the person baptized after God, and he is named after the whole Trinity. Baptism is the seal of God's covenant, the introductory rite into covenant with God, by which God covenants to be our God, and we covenant to be exclusively his people.

This makes the form of Baptism absolute proof of the Trinity.

If the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, do not exist in unity of the Godhead, then are Christians consecrated to one God, one creature, and one attribute or influence, or something else as fancy may explain.

Then does humanity, by baptism, enter into covenant with one God, one creature, and one attribute, influence, or something else.

"But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life." Jude 20, 21.

Here we have the three persons of the Godhead referred to as all equally concerned in our worship and our salvation.

"Keep yourselves in the love of God."

"Praying in the Holy Ghost."

"Looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, unto eternal life."

"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen." 2d Corinthians, xiii. 14.

Here the threefold blessing pronounced, corresponds to the three in the unity of the Godhead.

In the preceding text the Holy Ghost is named first; God, by which the Father is meant, second; and our Lord Jesus Christ last. In this text Christ is mentioned first, God the second, and the Holy Ghost last.

I propose to offer a brief reply to Mr. May's last argument, which was a denial of the miraculous conception of Christ, and an open attack upon the integrity of the Scriptures.

I regret the introduction of this topic in detail into the discussion. Not that I apprehend any difficulty in answering the objections of Mr. May, but because of its peculiar nature. But on him rests the responsibility. As he has given one side of the question in full, and that will be published, I must reply to the argument as he has spread it out before you.

I will commence with that remarkable prophecy :—

"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." Isa. vii. 14.

The history of this is, Pekah, king of Israel, had slain 120,000 persons in one day, and carried away captive 100,000. Rezin, king of Syria, being confederate with Pekah, had taken Elath, a fortified city, and carried the people to Damascus into captivity. Ahaz, king of Judah, no doubt feared the overthrow of the kingdom of Judah, and the extinction of the House of David. At this point Isaiah was sent to encourage him.

"Then said the Lord unto Isaiah, Go forth now to meet Ahaz. And say unto him, Take heed and be quiet; fear not, neither be faint-hearted, for the two tails of these smoking firebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah, have taken evil counsel against thee, saying, Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein for us, and set a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeal: Thus saith the Lord God, It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass." Isa. vii. 3-7.

Here is a promise of the defeat of his enemies, and this prediction ends.

To confirm Ahaz, he is told to ask a sign, which he refused to do.

The Prophet takes up a new aspect of the subject and names a sign.

"Behold a Virgin shall conceive," &c.

It is asked with much emphasis—

"But how could this be a sign to Ahaz?"

The meaning is, Rezin and Pekah shall not only fail, but the kingdom of Judah shall stand until a Virgin shall conceive and bear a son. That son was to be the Messiah. When the prediction was fulfilled by the birth of Christ, of

the Virgin Mary, the House of David failed forever. (See this view defended at large in Clarke's Commentary, a part of which is borrowed from Harmer's Overvation, Volume 1, page 299.)

Now let us look at the text itself. A Virgin, the Hebrew word is, *haalmah*. Dr. Roy, in his Hebrew and English Dictionary defines it thus : "The pure virgin, that is, one who never had intercourse with man."

Now come down to the New Testament. Matthew, in quoting the text, uses the Greek word *parthenos* to represent the Hebrew *haalmah*. Now, whatever may be the sense of the Hebrew, this Greek words means a virgin, in the truest and purest sense, and nothing else. It is defined thus, "A person unacquainted with the other sex."—Groves.

The word is found only fourteen times in the New Testament, and in every case it denotes a virgin in the true literal sense, except two, as follows :—

2d Cor. xi. 2, "That I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ."

Rev. xiv. 4, "These are they which were not defiled with women, for they are virgins."

In every other case where the word occurs, it means an unmarried, pure female. This settles the meaning of the Prophet as quoted by the Evangelist.

Now look at the record upon its face.

"Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise : When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus : for he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel ; which being interpreted, God with us. Then Joseph, being raised from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife. And knew her not until she had brought forth her first-

born son ; and he called his name Jesus." Matt. i. 18-25.

Here are several points worthy of notice.

1. The discovery that a child about to be born, was made before Joseph and Mary came together—that is, before the nuptial bands had been solemnized, they having only contracted marriage.

2. The feelings and purposes of Joseph, to put her away, clearly proves that he was not the father of the prospective child.

3. The fact is twice affirmed that Mary's prospective son had been begotten by the Holy Ghost. First, this is affirmed by the Evangelist that it was " Of the Holy Ghost." Second is repeated in the words of the angel to Joseph —" that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."

4. It is declared that that was a fulfillment of the words of the prophet, "A virgin shall be with child," &c.

5. It is affirmed that Joseph "knew her not, until she had brought forth her first-born son."

All these points make the matter of the miraculous conception as clear as it can be.

Now let us turn over to the gospel of St. Luke and examine the account there given of the same matter.

"And in the 6th month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth. To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David ; and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel came in unto her and said, Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee ; blessed art thou among women. And when she saw him she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favor with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man ? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee ; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Luke i. 26-35.

In this account we find all the essential facts recorded in Matthew.

1. The same account of the visit of the angel to Mary is here found.

2. She is declared to be a virgin, though espoused to Joseph.

3. Mary inquired of the angel how his prediction should be fulfilled, that she should have a son, to use her own words, "seeing I know not a man." This puts the matter beyond a doubt, that she was a virgin, and expected to remain a virgin for some time to come.

4. The angel answered. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

In Luke iii. 23, we read—

"And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being, (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli."

This clearly implies that Jesus was not the natural son of Joseph. Moreover, it proves that the preceding cannot have been interpolated at an after period. The allusion to what is recorded in the first chapter, and also to what is recorded in Matthew, is so plain, that they cannot be interpolations, unless this also be interpolated. But more of this soon.

There is an allusion to the same matter, chapter 2d:

"And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his name was called Jesus, which was so named of the angel before he was conceived in the womb."

If you strike out the miraculous conception, you strike out the visit of the angel, and the naming of him Jesus, here referred to, and this second chapter must be struck out also.

Having now spread the main facts of the record before you; let me glance at Mr. May's reasons for denying this portion of these two gospels.

1. He urged the genealogies as given by Matthew and Luke, insisting that I must abandon them as useless, or abandon my argument. I reply, all his labor on that was lost, for the argument in no sense depends upon them. They were, no doubt, copied from existing records, and their correctness or incorrectness need not be discussed in connection with the present argument.

2. It was urged that the Jews supposed him to be the son of Joseph. This is admitted, but it does not prove that he was, any more than the fact that they supposed that he was not the Christ proves that he was not. As a matter of course, he would be called the son of Joseph.

3. It was urged that the Jews expected the Messiah to be a man, and no more than a man. This is a mistake. The Jews repeatedly made

the fact that they knew him and his parents a reason for rejecting him as the promised Messiah.

"Howbeit we know this man whence he is: but when Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence he is." John vii. 27.

If my friend had been a little more careful to study his Bible, he might have saved himself this and other mistakes.

4. He next urged that his friends wondered at him, and even thought him deranged, which he supposes they would not, if they had understood his miraculous conception. This has no bearing on the subject, for the whole matter may have rested in the bosoms of Joseph and Mary, until after his entry upon his public labors, and it is written—

"But Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart." Luke ii. 19.

"But his mother Mary kept all these sayings in her heart." Verse 51.

5. He quoted as a parallel text, that which speaks of Melchizedek as without father and without mother. (Heb. vii. 3.)

This only proves his weakness, for all that can be meant is that there is no genealogy of Melchizedek; no record of his father or mother, of his birth or death.

MR. MAY'S FIRST SPEECH.

I am as anxious to close this discussion as my friend can be, but more anxious to do the subject justice, and must therefore notice some incidental matters he has introduced.

You will remember his abrupt challenge with questions, on a former occasion. And when I would have turned to the Scriptures to reply in their language, he hurried me by demanding that I answer yes or no. I did answer that I believe Jesus to be the son of Joseph. But did he suppose that I would not afterward give my reasons for that belief? Since then I have given them. They are before you. They will be published in full, and I hope you will read them, and you will find therein the best answer to his attempted reply. The responsibility of introducing the theme of the conception and parentage of Jesus, must however rest with Mr. Lee. All I said on this matter was amply sustained by authorities of the orthodox school.

The only new idea Mr. Lee has given in his rejoinder to me, was that the child Jesus was to be the seed of the woman and not of the man. This, however, he must prove. I peremptorily deny it. When he furnishes arguments to prove it, then will I attempt to disprove it.

The whole question rests on the genuineness of the passages in Matthew and Luke. And the best answer to his assertions of their genuineness is to be found in my argument as it will be published. Read it over again.

I did not expect that my views would be agreed to at once. If I am in error I am willing to be set right. So should you, my friend. For who wants to be in error? I am sure I do not. I have studied the Scriptures for years and years, but I am compelled to discredit the story of the miraculous conception of Jesus. The only quotation I made from any other than an orthodox authority, was from the writings of Dr. Priestly. And who has studied more than he, the writings of the ancients and the works of the Christian fathers? He gives the authority of Jerome for the adverse opinion expressed of the genuineness of the passage relating to the miraculous conception. These, sir, are all the remarks I think it is necessary for me to make on this matter.

By the kindness of Mr. Lee I have been allowed to prepare my answer to his argument in behalf of the personality and deity of the Holy Ghost, with his manuscript before me. I shall, therefore, not be in danger of misrepresenting any of the points he attempted to make; and, moreover, by classifying the texts which he quoted, shall be able, I trust, greatly to abridge what I conceive will be a refutation of them.

Before, however, I take up his texts separately or in groups, I wish to explain to you the principles of interpretation by which I expect to discover and unfold their real meaning. All who have heard this discussion must have perceived that I do not always accept the *literal* meaning of a passage of Scripture, but judge from itself, or its context, or its relation to other passages on the same subject, whether it should not rather be interpreted more or less figuratively. I by no means claim that this principle is peculiar to myself, or to those whose theological opinions are similar to my own. All readers of the Bible do and must apply it in respect to some subjects. They cannot do otherwise in reading a book so figurative as the Bible is. And there is no good reason why this principle should not be properly applied in the interpretation of passages relating to the great question that is here under discussion.

Instead of trying to decide what the phrase Holy Ghost, or Holy Spirit, may or may not mean, in any particular passage, it seems to me more rational first, by an etymological exami-

nation of the phrase, to ascertain what it may mean, and then, by the comparison of a sufficient number of passages in which it occurs, find out what it generally does mean in the Bible. We shall afterwards be able to determine with more confidence, what it must mean in any given case.

The English word, Ghost, is from the *Saxon*, "gast," and means the spirit or soul of man. It is used, I believe, only six times in the whole Old Testament, and in every instance in reference to the death of some individual, of whom it is said he gave or yielded up the ghost: that is, his spirit left his body.

Throughout the Old Testament, I believe, the phrase Holy Ghost does not once occur. And in the New Testament, wherever Holy Ghost is used, Holy Spirit would be a better translation, as ghost is obsolete. One of the first definitions given in the Lexicons of Ruach, (in Hebrew,) and of Pneuma, (in Greek,) (which means spirit,) is wind, air in motion. And the phrase, "of God," being in the Hebrew language a superlative, the Spirit of God sometimes signifies "a mighty wind."

There are some who think this is the true rendering of the Hebrew phrase. "Spirit of God," in Gen. i. 2, "And a mighty wind moved upon the face of the waters." I believe it is so translated in the Septuagint version. Maimonides, "who is generally reckoned as learned and judicious a writer as any of the Jewish Rabbins," in showing the several acceptations of the word spirit, says, as cited by Dr. Lardner, the word signifies air and wind, and he gives as examples Gen. i. 2, and Exod. x. 13, 19. The word "Ruach," in Hebrew, and "Pneuma," in Greek, means also, *vital breath*. Ps. lxxviii. 38, "He remembereth that they were but flesh, a wind, (a spirit) that passeth away and cometh not again." It is used, also, Gen. vi. 17, "And all flesh wherein is the breath of life." It signifies, also, the divine influence that inspired the prophets and enabled them to prophesy. Num. xi. 17. When the seventy elders were appointed God said unto Moses "I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them." And again, in the 25th verse we read, "And the Lord * * * took the spirit that was upon him, (Moses,) and gave it unto the seventy elders, and it came to pass that when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied." Bishop Burnet, in his "Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles," Article 4, page 67, gives us this comment, "Spirit, signifies wind;

or breath ; and in the Old Testament it stand frequently in that sense. The *Spirit of God*, or *wind of God*, stands sometimes for a high and strong wind ; but more frequently it signifies a secret impression made by God on the mind of a prophet."

"It is further admitted," says Doctor J. P. Smith, in his Scripture testimony to the Messiah, "It is further admitted that, in many places the phrase, *Spirit of God*, and its synonyms are used to denote any especial *influence* or *energy of God*, whether exercised in a miraculous manner, or according to the ordinary laws of nature." See Trinitarian Concessions, page 95.

Gesenius, whose Lexicon has been repeatedly quoted and justly commended by Mr. Lee, says, in reference to the word *Ruh*, or *ruach*, it means, "The spirit of God or Jehovah ; more properly by way of eminence, the spirit, or God's holy spirit." By this name is denoted the life-giving breath or power of God, in men and animals, Job xxvii. 3, xxxiii. 4, Ps. civ. 30, Gen. vi. 3 ; which operates also through inanimate nature, Job xxvi. 13 ; which moved over the chaotic mass in the creation, Gen. i. 2, and produces whatever is noble and good in man, by making him wise, Job xxxii. 18 ; by leading him to virtue, Ps. li. 11, and by guiding him generally, Hag. ii. 5 ; Ps. cxlii. 10 ; Neh. ix. 20. But it is especially applied to extraordinary powers and gifts, e. g. of the artificer, Exod. xxxi. 3, xxxv. 31, of the warrior, Jud. iii. 10 ; vi. 34 ; xi. 29 : xiii. 25 ; of the ruler, Isa. xi. 2 ; of the prophet, Num. xxiv. 2 ; 1st x. 6, 10 ; xix. 20, 23 ; of the interpreter of dreams, Gen. xli. 38. Hence, *man of the spirit*, = prophet, Hos. ix. 7 ; and the *spirit*, 1st Kings, xxii. 21 ; 2d Chron. xxviii. 20 ; the spirit of the prophets, or the power which inspires them, (personified.) This spirit David acquires at his anointing 1st, Sam. xvi. 13. It departs from Saul, 1st Sam. xv. 14. That of Elijah rests upon Elisha, 2d. Kings, ii. 15. A part of the spirit of Moses is transferred to the seventy elders, Num. xi. 17. It is promised to all men in the golden age, Joel ii. 28 ; Isa. xliv. 3, lxx. 21. In this sense of divine power it is sometimes opposed to *flesh* or human power ; as Isa. xxxi. 3, "Their horses are flesh and not spirit." Zech. iv. 6, that is something earthly not divine.

In such passages as Job vi. 4 ; Isa. xxxi. 1 ; Ps. cxxxix. 7, it may be regarded like soul, as a mere periphrasis of the personal pronoun." See Gesenius, Gibb's edition.

Thus have I given to Mr. Lee, from one whom

he has several times quoted as the highest authority touching the meaning of Hebrew words — the assurance that the phrases "Holy Spirit, Spirit of God," &c., are employed by the sacred writers of the Old Testament in a great variety of significations, and that even when applied to the Almighty, they have no necessary reference to any personal distinctions in his nature.

The Greek word *pneuma* will be found in almost every particular to correspond, in its significations, to the Hebrew *ruach*, as may be seen by turning to the references in Whal's Lexicon of the New Testament, by Prof. Robinson, of Andover ; and to the Lexicon of the New Testament, by Schleusner, who is as high an authority in Greek as Gesenius is in the Hebrew language.

Let me now remind my opponent that *ruach* in Hebrew, and *pneuma* in Greek, are both neuter, that is to say *impersonal*, and are often so regarded by the translators of our common version, even where the holy spirit is spoken of. For example, Rom. viii. 16, "The spirit *itself* beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." And again in the 26th verse, "the spirit *itself* maketh intercession for us." But where can my friend point me to the use of a neuter pronoun, with reference to the Father or the Son. How absurd it would sound to say, "There is one God and none other but it," "God *itself*, even our Father ;" or to say, "Christ loved the Church, and gave *itself* for it." Often, where the pronoun *he* or *him* occurs in the English translation in reference to the spirit, it is in the original the neuter pronoun, that should have been translated *it*. In John xiv. 17, the neuter pronoun is four times mis-translated. According to the Greek, the verse reads, "The spirit of Truth, which the world cannot receive, because it seeth *it* not neither knoweth *it*, but ye know *it*, for *it* dwelleth with you and shall be in you."

Ruach and *pneuma* being neuter nouns, is clearly and decisively in favor of the impersonality of the holy spirit, excepting where, as is frequently the case, the spirit, or the holy spirit, is put for God ; just as the mind or spirit of a man is put for the man himself, and so personified.

No Unitarians, that I am acquainted with, deny the personality of the Holy Spirit—certainly I do not—wherever it is used as equivalent to God himself. In the *Christian Examiner**

* The *Christian Examiner*, published in Boston, is the prominent Unitarian periodical.

for this very month, in a review of Prof. Maurice's Essays, the writer—a Professor in the Cambridge Divinity School—says, "It is true, that Unitarians believe that the phrase Holy Spirit, besides denoting the personal God acting on the human soul, is also used figuratively to denote the instrumentalities by which he works, or the effects which he produces, and the gifts which he bestows. But they would as soon think of maintaining that the spirit of a man is not personal, as that the spirit of God is not personal."

What I contend against, Mr. chairman, is the idea and the doctrine that the Holy Spirit exists as a person, in and of itself, any more than the mind or spirit of a man is a person or being distinct from the man himself.

St. Paul has taught, plainly enough, that there is an analogy and likeness between the relation that the Holy Spirit bears to the living God, and the relation that the spirit of a man bears to the man himself.

1st Cor. ii. 11, "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man, which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man (or no one) but the spirit of God."

As then the spirit of a man is certainly not another person distinct from him, but (as Paul's illustration shows,) a certain self-consciousness whereby he is able to contemplate himself, and to know those things which belong peculiarly to him, and with which none beside can be acquainted, except he reveal them; so neither is the spirit of God a distinct person from God, but is that divine intelligence, wisdom, and energy, which is essentially in him, and by the communication of which he reveals and manifests himself to his rational creatures. Such revelation the Apostle claims to have received, in the next verse, which is moreover very instructive to us on the subject now immediately under consideration. His words are, verse 12th, "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things which are freely given to us of God."

The spirit of God is here plainly contrasted with the spirit of the world; now the spirit of the world is certainly not a person distinct from the world, what reason then can there be to suppose that the *Spirit of God*, which is contrasted with it, is a person distinct from God?

There is another illustration of the truth on this point, given by our Saviour himself, which is still more striking and beautiful. You will

find it in his conversation with Nicodemus, on the new birth, in John iii. 8, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the spirit."

Now, Mr. chairman, my friend on the other side will not deny that, in the original, the first word of this remarkable sentence translated "the wind," is the same as the last word, which is translated "the spirit." We have here, then, an illustration of the truth, as I hold it, against my brother, given by Jesus himself, probably plain and as clear an illustration as such a subject admits of. Look at it; consider it a moment. The air is an invisible something, by which we are surrounded, and which we must inspire continually in order to live. When this air is put in motion, we call it wind; we hear it, we feel its pressure upon us, and are much more conscious of its presence and effects than when it is still. But how the motion of the air commences, we do not fully know—whence the wind cometh and whether it goeth we cannot tell. Now, as our Saviour more than intimates, the case is the same in the regeneration of man. God is a Holy Spirit, invisible, but everywhere present. "In him we live and move and have our being." The dependence of our physical being upon the air, for its continuance, is not more entire than is our dependence upon God for the continuance and growth of our moral and our spiritual being—the life of our souls. When we cease to inspire from God, we are spiritually dead. The ordinary influence of his Holy Spirit upon us, we are (too many of us,) no more conscious of than we are of the life-sustaining power of the air upon our mortal bodies; but whenever his Holy Spirit moves especially within us, or upon others within the sphere of our observation, we see and feel and own its presence and effects, but we can no more, in this case than in the other, always, if ever, tell how or why that spirit began to move and operate upon us or others, just when and as it did. It seems to me, sir, that the analogy between the two is perfect; and our Saviour's illustration shows, as plainly as anything can be shown, how we are to understand all that class of texts quoted by Mr. Lee, in which God is spoken of as sending his spirit, or pouring out his spirit, or in anywise operating by his spirit, or the spirit, or the holy spirit.

But my friend insisted, the other evening, that the personal actions attributed to the holy

spirit, the works said to be performed by it, such as creation, the working of miracles, &c., are a proof of its proper individual personality. But such an argument might be urged with equal propriety and force to show, that the mind or spirit of a man is a person distinct from the man whose spirit is spoken of. The mind, the soul, the spirit of a man is the higher part of his nature; it is capable of great and important operations, such as reasoning, reflecting, forming designs and carrying those designs into execution. Now these are certainly personal actions. Does, then, the attributing these actions to the mind prove the mind, the spirit, to be a proper person, separate from, or in any way distinguishable from the person? Does not every one understand that the personal responsibility, the praise or the blame due to these actions, must and will attach to the person by whose mind or spirit they were performed? Even man, you see, is a being of whose whole personality we do not often speak when we are describing his actions. Sometimes we allude to his muscular strength, or his animal courage, which would be nothing, indeed, if it were not quickened by his soul—his spirit. Then we speak of his affections and passions, which are, by many, supposed to reside in the region of his heart, because of the commotion they cause in that organ; yet these are subject to the control of his reason and conscience, nay, even to his will, and that to such a degree that their intensest emotion shall not, if he chooses, quicken the pulsations of the heart.

And again, we often speak of a man's intellectual genius, of his skill in mathematics, his power in logical argumentation, his inspiration in poetry, or, better yet, of his benevolent or his devout spirit. Now, sir, are all these different properties or manifestations of the man, to be regarded as so many separate persons included in his human unity? Why not. Sir, if my brother's argument to prove the separate personality of the spirit of God, be a sound argument? If we often find it necessary to speak, even of the finite creature man, so as to imply only the action of a part of his whole being, how much more may we be often obliged, when we speak of the Infinite Jehovah, to use language that will apply only to one or more of his attributes, or one or more of his manifestations!

My friend says, the work of creation is attributed to the Spirit of God: and therefore contends that the Spirit of God must have a per-

sonal existence, distinct from God. Strange inference. As much as to say that the manifestation of his power and wisdom proves that there must be another person to whom those divine attributes belong. Sir, the arguments of my friend to show the deity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, if sound, would strip the Father of all his attributes and manifestations, and leave him nothing but naked personality, if, indeed, he would be anything more than a nonentity. Mr. Lee quoted a number of texts in which creative power is attributed to the Holy Ghost. I need not repeat them. It would take up too much time, and then I do not deny what they declare, for by the Spirit, the Holy Spirit, or Holy Ghost, in all those instances I understand either God himself, or the manifestation of one or more of his attributes, as the case may be. Thus am I obliged to interpret such passages, or else, according to Mr. Lee's method of proof, acknowledge that there were a number more persons, by whom the heavens and the earth were made. I ask you, sir, I ask my friend Lee, to look again at this matter in the light of other Scriptures. The work of creation is attributed, not only to the spirit of God, but to the word of God, to his breath, to his fingers, to his hands, to his wisdom, to his understanding, to his knowledge. Here the declarations of the Psalmist, of Prophets, of Apostles. Ps. xxxiii. 6. "By the *word* of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the *breath* of his mouth." Job, xxvi. 13, "By his *spirit* he hath garnished the heavens; his *hand* hath formed the crooked serpents." Job xxxiii. 4, "The *Spirit* of God hath made me, and the *breath* of the Almighty hath given me life." Ps. viii. 3, "When I consider thy heavens the work of *thy fingers*, the moon and stars which thou hast ordained," &c. Ps. cxix. 73, "Thy *hands* have made me and fashioned me." Prov. iii. 19, 20, "The Lord by *wisdom* hath founded the earth; by *understanding* hath he established the heavens; by *his knowledge* the depths are broken up and the clouds drop down the dew."

If I could argue on these expressions as Mr. Lee did the other evening, upon kindred ones respecting the Spirit of God, I should say, how could the Lord have founded the earth by *wisdom*, unless wisdom was a person who could do such a mighty work? How could the Lord, by *understanding*, have established the heavens, unless understanding were a person powerful enough to put up the pillars upon which, in an-

other part of Scripture, they are said to rest? And how could he, by his knowledge, have broken up the depths, unless knowledge were a person who could descend and do that work? All this would seem to you, perhaps, as it does to me, egregious trifling with the sublime language of the sacred writers, and yet, wherein is it more trifling than some of the comments my brother made upon several of the texts he urged upon us the last evening as proofs of the personality of the spirit. See his comments upon Ps. civ. 30; Ps. cxxxix. 7-10; Is. lxi. 1; Luke, iv. 21; Ezek. iii. 12-14.

MR. LEE'S SECOND SPEECH.

When I sat down I was about noticing Mr. May's comment on Melchisedec's case who was without father or mother, as a parallel with the case of Christ's miraculous conception. But it bears no analogy to the account of Christ's miraculous conception by the Holy Ghost. It cannot even serve to explain the sense of the record, because he rejects it as an interpolation. For him to deny the record, and then quote such a text to explain away its force, is really trifling.

6. He contended that he was a man and therefore was not miraculously begotten. This is trifling, for a human being could be begotten by the power of the Holy Ghost. I contend that he was an entire and perfect man, it is fundamental to my argument. Why then does he so repeatedly quote his proof texts that he was a man? I admit it. Let him rest on this admitted fact that he was a man, and prove from it, if he can, that he was no more than a man. But instead of proving from the fact that he was a man, that he could be no more than a man, he proceeds every time to repeat his proofs that he was a man. Let me show up his logic on this point. He argues in a circle. He was only a man because he was not miraculously begotten, and he was not miraculously begotten because only a man.

7. He has plainly denied the record, and declared that those portions of Matthew's and Luke's gospels which treat of the pedigree, conception and birth of Christ, are interpolations and false.

He rests this upon the statements of Dr. Priestly, whom he says has proved that the corruption was detected and exposed by the Ebionites.

Mr. May said—I quoted Jerome in proof of that.

Mr. Lee—You did not quote Jerome.

Mr. May—O yes, I quoted his very words. Mr. Lee—from Dr. Priestly, who may not be reliable.

Mr. May—He is a true man.

Mr. Lee—I don't know that—We shall see about it.

1. Dr. Priestly has proved no such thing. He was himself a materialist, and denied the immortality of the soul.

Mr. May said—Will you give your authority for that.

Mr. Lee—I will before I get through.

2. The Ebionites were a class of corrupt heretics which arose in the second century.

Their history is this. A portion of the Christians held to the law of Moses and continued to practice Jewish rites. This was tolerated, until the final destruction of Jerusalem by Adrian, who enacted the most severe laws against the Jews. Then the real believers in Jesus Christ abandoned all Jewish rites, so as not to be confounded with the Jews, against whom those severe laws were directed. This brought a separation, and those who would not abandon the Jewish ritual, became a sect, called Nazarenes.

They then divided again, and a sect split off from the Nazarenes, called Ebionites. The Nazarenes held to the miraculous conception of Christ, but the Ebionites denied it, and placed him on a level with Moses. This is the sect whose authority Mr. May plead through Dr. Priestly, in proof that the account of the conception and birth of Christ is a forgery.

Now, what did they believe. They held that the ceremonial law of Moses was binding, not only on the Jews, but on all the Gentiles on becoming Christians.

They received with an equal degree of veneration, the superstitions and ceremonies which the Pharisees had added to the law of Moses. They held all these to be binding.

They held only to the inspiration of the Books of Moses, and rejected all the prophets, and the Psalms, and held the name of David and Solomon in contempt.

They rejected all of St. Paul's epistles, and treated them and their author with contempt.

They held several books as Christian Scriptures, which do not belong to our New Testament, one of which was called the travels of Peter. They either rejected or never had the gospels by St. Mark and Luke. They had the gospel of St. Matthew, omitting its first two chapters, and corrupting it in other places. That this portion was stricken out by them, and not added by the orthodox Christians, is clear from this fact, they and the Nazarenes separated from the body of christians together. They afterwards divided, and the copy of the gospel used by the Nazarenes, was entire and that of the Ebionites was wanting the first two chapters.

For the proof of all these points, I refer you to Mosheims Church History, Part II. Chap. V. History of Christianity the first three Centuries. By Mosheim. Another and new work, by the same author. Buck's Theological Dictionary, Article Ebionites—Neander's Planting and Training of the Church; Book IV. Chap. I. I will also refer you to Horsley's Tracts. In which Dr. Horsley, grappled with and demolished Dr. Priestly on the subject. You now see on what baseless ground, Mr. May dares to lay his hand upon and mutilate the gospels of Matthew and Luke.

This confirms what I said a number of evenings ago, that he who will affirm that a given doctrine is more clearly revealed in the Scriptures than any other doctrine, and yet that he does not believe it, does not believe any thing because it is in the Scriptures. Now you see plainly, that when a doctrine is undeniably found in the Scriptures, which he is not disposed to believe, he rejects that portion of the Scriptures itself.

Yet on the last evening he complained of me for representing him as treating the Scriptures lightly. He has left the shore and is wading out into the dark and uncertain waters of scepticism; and when I point to the fact, he sends back a complaining echo, that I remind him and you of his position, and progresses on, further and deeper, complaining still that I point to the direction in which he is going before he is lost from view in the cheerless and visionless waters of infidelity.

The manner in which facts have been drawn out of him, furnishes clear evidence that the

argument is lost, as a Bible question, in his own estimation. He would never have committed himself against the Scriptures, could he have escaped my conclusions without denying portions of them.

In New England this has become a striking fact in the history of Unitarianism. A portion of that sect, have gone off farther and farther from the truth, denying and rejecting the inspiration of the Scriptures because they do not sustain their views. Another portion are drawing back from this tendency of their system, and are rallying more to the orthodox standard. Mr. May has quoted to you numerous orthodox authorities. Now on this point I will give one. It shows that Unitarian writers are coming back to the truth. The work I hold in my hand is published by the Unitarian Association. It is by authority. The writer is Mr. E. H. Sears. I quote from Chap. viii. on "The Mediator."

"The theology of the New Testament involves three leading ideas, all of which centre in the person of Jesus Christ.

"First, there is a perfect and glorified HUMAN NATURE, exhibiting in its changes from its humiliation to its exaltation all the possible virtues, graces, and excellencies that belong to our human condition.

"Secondly, there is the DIVINE NATURE in its paternal benignity, infinite wisdom, and universal and unchanging love, contrasting with the dark and partial conceptions of God which prevailed among Jews and Gentiles.

"Thirdly, there is the UNION of these two in Jesus Christ, so that in him are revealed at the same time a perfect humanity and the all-perfect Divinity.

"It is no example of mere human nature, however sublimated and exalted, that satisfies our wants as sinful men. No finite power and influence can create us anew. No models of human virtue, however pure and perfect, are to regenerate and save us. Rather do they dazzle and mock us with ideals which we can never realize ourselves. I may fix on them my earnest and despairing gaze; but there aloft they shine and shine in vain, giving me gleams of a region of purity and peace which I cannot climb to, and which fall upon my unsunned and frozen nature like the shimmer of moonbeams upon a mass of snow. Christ has placed before me an example of human perfection, and told me to follow in his steps. And is that all? If that be all, it were like standing on the shore and helping a drowning man by merely shouting to him to rise and walk the waves. In our fallen, sinful state, it is not first and

chiefly an example that we want. We want God. We want Divine succor and influence, coming within us with creative power, not primarily to bring us into conformity, with some model that is placed before us, but to revive the Divine image within us, so that by its own radiation it shall produce around us the halo of all Christian virtues and graces.

"The New Testament writers are careful to inform us that the man Christ Jesus had no human father, but that the Holy Spirit itself descended into this world and took its normal clothing of flesh and blood and its expression in the human form. They put this fact in the foreground of the Christian theology, for by this fact they make the Author of Christianity not an inspired prophet, but a Divine Man. The prophet is inspired to utter his message, and that done he is like other men. Christ was not inspired after birth, but the effluence of the Divine nature formed the inmost principle of his natural being, so that his most common words and works had their ground in the ingenerating Divinity. The natural life of Christ became hence the *expression of God*, and the influence proceeding from him the effusion of the Holy Spirit.

"St. John asserts the same truth in describing the Divine Word made flesh, that is, brought down into the conditions of mortal existence and clothed in human form. He is asserting the ground of Christ's plenary authority and wisdom, and this he does by describing these fleshly surroundings as enfolding the Divine wisdom, life within life,—the infinite become visible in the finite, not by being superinduced upon Christ by special gift, but by forming the inmost principle of his natural being. Nothing less than this satisfies the record of the supernatural conception by Matthew, or of the Divine incarnation by John.

"We lay off all the theories of the schoolmen pertaining to the mode of union between God and Christ. We forget all the disputes of the sects upon this question. We recognize the fact that such a union, though it may involve mysteries, involves no contradictions. We do not stop at what is mortal and finite in the fact of the Divine incarnation; we do not even see the finite, but look through it as we look through glass to see the sun; and then the Divine nature unveils itself to our longing vision, and out of Jesus Christ comes the unclouded blaze of the Godhead!"

Now I furnished my friend with one Unitarian authority.

Yes, said Mr. May, and a good one too.

In my appeal to the early history of the Church, I shall not classify my authorities according to the several points I have argued, as the divinity of Christ, and the Holy Spirit,

but apply them where they belong as I quote.

My extracts of course, must be few and brief.

I will name each author, and age in which he flourished, and the source from which I quote him.

ST. CLEMENT was cotemporary with Paul, Peter and John, and suffered martyrdom. A. D. 100.

He says, "Christ is theirs who are humble, not who exalt themselves over his flock. The Sceptre of the Majesty of God our Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the show of pride."—*1 Epis. to Cor. Sec. 16.*

ST. IGNATIUS was cotemporary with Paul and Peter, and suffered martyrdom A. D. 107.

He says of Christians, "Being united and chosen through his true passion according to the will of the Father, and Jesus Christ our God."—*Inscription to Epis. Eph.*

"There is one physician, both fleshy and spiritual, made and not made; God incarnate; true life in death, both of Mary and God; first passible, then impassible, even Jesus Christ our Lord."—*Sec. 7.*

"Where is the wise man? Where is the disputer? Where is the boasting of those who are called wise? For our God, Jesus Christ, was according to the Dispensation of God, conceived in the womb of Mary, of the seed of David, by the Holy Ghost."—*See 18.*

"God himself appearing in the form of a man, for the renewal of eternal life."—*Sec 19.*

"The majesty of Jesus Christ, who was before all ages, and appeared in the end to us."—*Epis. to Magnesians, Sec 6.*

In his Epistle to the Romans the expression, "Jesus Christ our God" occurs twice in the Inscription.

"Nothing is good that is seen; for even our God, Jesus Christ, now that he is in the Father, does so much the more appear."—*Sec 3.*

"I glorify God, even Jesus Christ."—*Epis. to Smyrneans, Sec 1.*

"I wish you all happiness in our God, Jesus Christ, in whom continue, in the unity and protection of God."—*Epis. to Polycarp, Sec 8.*

POLYCARP was a disciple of St. John, and commenced his ministry under him.

He was the minister of the Church at Smyr-

na, and is supposed to be the subject of the following reference.—Rev. ii. 8, 9, 10.

“ Unto the angel of the church in Smyrna write :—These things saith the first and the last, which was dead and is alive. I know thy works, and tribulation and poverty, (but thou art rich,) and the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan. Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer : behold, the devil shall cast *some* of you into prison, that ye may be tried : and ye shall have tribulation ten days : be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.”

This was the only church out of the seven, against which no charge was preferred.

This man of God who had been instructed by St. John, when he was at the stake ready to be burned, closed his last prayer thus :

“ I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee, by the eternal and heavenly high priest, Jesus Christ, thy well beloved Son, with whom, to thee and the Holy Ghost, be glory, both now and to all succeeding ages. Amen.”—*Martyrdom of St. Polycarp*, Sec 14.

The narrative then states that measures were taken to prevent his friends from obtaining the remains of his body, for which the following reason is given. “ Lest, says he, forsaking him that was crucified, they should begin to worship this Polycarp : not considering that neither is it possible for us ever to forsake Christ, who suffered for the salvation of all such as shall be saved throughout the whole world, the righteous for the unrighteous ; nor worship any other but him. For him as the Son of God we do adore.”—Sec 17.

Barnabas was the companion of Paul. “ And for this cause the Lord was content to suffer for our souls, although he be the Lord of the whole earth, to whom God said before the beginning of the world. Let us make man after our own likeness and image.”—*Epistle Sec 5.*

“ The prophets having received from him [Christ] the spirit of prophecy, spake before concerning him.”—Ib.

“ Then he clearly manifested himself to be the Son of God. For had he not come in the flesh, how could men have been able to look upon him that they might be saved ? seeing if

they behold only the sun which is the work of his hands, and shall hereafter cease to be, they are not able to endure steadfastly to look against the rays of it.”—Ib.

Hermas is mentioned by St. Paul, Rom. xvi. 14. “ Salute Hermas. In his ninth similitude we find the following.

“ In the middle of the plain he showed me a huge white rock which rose out of the plain ; and the rock was higher than those mountains, and was square so that it seemed capable of supporting the whole world. It looked to me to be old, and yet had it a new gate.”

“ First of all, said I, tell me what this rock and this gate denote. Hearken, said he, this rock and this gate are the Son of God. The Son of God is, indeed, more ancient than any creature ; in so much that he was in counsel with the Father at the creation of all things. But the gate is therefore new, because he appeared in the last days, at the fullness of time, that they who shall attain unto salvation, may by it enter into the Kingdom of God.”—Sec 2 & 12.

MR. MAY'S SECOND SPEECH.

It may be an interesting fact to you Sir, and I am sure it will be to my friend Lee, that I have distributed among the members of my society and to others in this city, a hundred and twenty copies of the book he has just been reading from, “ *Sears on Regeneration*” since the first of January. And only last week received fifty copies more, which that gentleman, (pointing to Mr. T. G. White,) has on hand and will be happy to dispose of. I have done all this with some reluctance, on account of the errors which the book certainly contains—but that reluctance has been overcome by my admiration of the book as a whole—and my belief that the circulation of it will do good.

Mr. Lee next charges me with arguing in a circle—but the circle wants just one half. I never argued that Jesus was not the deity because he was not miraculously born. For, Sir, as you must remember, I contended, that if he were miraculously born, that would not prove him to be God any more than the miraculous conception of John the Baptist proved him to be a deity. I alluded also to the supernatural birth of Samson and Isaac—and spoke of Melchisedee who is said to have had neither father

nor mother; and of Adam who certainly had no human parents, and was called "the Son of God," and yet never was supposed to be a God.

I am utterly at a loss to know, where Mr. Lee got his authority for asserting, that Dr. Priestly did not believe in the *immortality of the Soul*. That great man was a materialist, and may not have believed in the natural immortality of the Soul;—but he had a strong and lively faith in that doctrine, based upon the resurrection of Jesus Christ, where Saint Paul placed it.

Mr. Lee—did he not believe in the sleep of the soul.

Mr. May—I suppose he did; and that at the last day man shall be brought to life again, as St. Paul seems to teach in his "epistle to the Corinthians."

Mr. Lee—Can immortality die or sleep?

Mr. May—It was I believe Dr. Priestly's view that the soul does sleep until the resurrection.

But, Sir, much as we may be startled and offended at the doctrine of materialism—Dr. Priestly was one of the purest and best of men—a man of great scientific attainments, and a diligent student of the Scriptures and of ecclesiastical history. I could, Sir, if this were the time and place, bring the highest testimonials to his excellence of character, given by men, who differed as widely as possible from him in his theological faith.

But let us turn to the subject of our discussion.

One reason, Mr. Chairman, why the readers of our English Bible have, so many of them, been misled on the subject we are now considering is—that the phrases Holy Ghost, and Holy Spirit always, and Spirit of God generally and the word Spirit often, are printed in our translations with capital initials, as if they were proper names, or the names of persons. I know not on what authority this was done, or with what more propriety than would have been shown, in printing the words breath, hand, fingers, wisdom, understanding, in the same way, where they are put for the agents or instruments of God. Now, this never ought to have been done excepting in those few cases where the phrase is obviously put for God himself. The Greek phrase meaning, Holy Spirit

—to *pneuma to hagion* is in the neuter gender; and is not printed in the original, as if it were a proper name.

Mr. Lee stated in the opening of his argument, that the points to be proved by him were, that "the Holy Ghost is of one substance, power and eternity with the Father existing, personally distinct, yet in unity of the Godhead."

You Sir, and the audiences that have attended so diligently upon this protracted discussion must understand that I do not deny, and never have denied the Holy Spirit. I believe Sir, that God the Father is a Spirit, holy beyond thought, and the fountain of holiness to all who receive him. Of course I do not deny that his Spirit is of the same substance, power and eternity with himself, for his spirit is himself, in the highest sense. What I have denied from the first and persist now in denying is that the Spirit of the Father does or can exist personally distinct from him; so as to be with any propriety addressed or thought of as a distinct person. If my brother's proposition be true, then the Father must have a Spirit besides the Holy Spirit, or else he must be a person without a Spirit. If I understand my friend's answer to my question the other evening, he believes that the Son, the Second Person of the Trinity, Jesus Christ had a human soul as well as a body, and that his perfect humanity still exists in inseparable connection with the Godhead. We have then in the Godhead, according to my friend's faith, if I understand it—we have the Father with a spirit peculiar to himself, and the Son with a perfect human Spirit peculiar to himself, and the Holy Spirit. So that three persons and five spirits compose the Godhead. All this, my friend's proposition involves, or else I have wholly misunderstood his statements, his arguments and his answers to my questions.

If he could show me this most incomprehensible doctrine unequivocally declared in the words of Jesus, or of one of his apostles, I should not set about to scrutinize and question and expose it as I have done and must yet do—regarding it as I do a sheer invention of the platonizing Christians of the 3d and 4th centuries.

In my first speech this evening, I gave you some illustration of the principles of interpretation, that must needs be applied in the exam-

ination of the passages of Scripture adduced by Mr. Lee. Let us now apply them to as many as time will allow.

I pass over the first point of his argument and the texts quoted to sustain it, because I have already shown more than once in the course of our discussion, that the bestowment of many of the names of God upon his angels, prophets, messengers, was not uncommon amongst the Jews—and merely implied, that they represented his authority, acted on a commission from him, or were sent to signify his purpose or will at some important crisis. If such exalted names were sometimes given to *ministers of his will*, surely they may be given to his own Holy Spirit, which is as much himself as a man's spirit is himself—without giving the slightest countenance to the idea that therefore his Spirit is a person distinct from himself.

Mr. Lee adduced Exod. xvii. 7. And he called the name of the place "Massah and Meribah" because there the children of Israel tempted the Lord. The Lord here spoken of, my friend thinks, the author of the Epis. to the Hebrews has shown to be the Holy Ghost iii. 7-9. "Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith—to-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation—&c., your fathers tempted me, proved me and saw my works, &c." Now, here the writer to the Hebrews does not say, that the Jehovah they tempted was the Holy Ghost, nor does he quote the passage in Exodus; he is quoting a passage which you will find exactly as he quotes it, in Ps. xcvi. 7-9, and he introduces the quotation "as the Holy Spirit saith." If you will turn to the Psalm, you will see that the Holy Ghost is not so much as mentioned there—but Jehovah only. Neither in Exod. xvii. 7, is any thing said about such a person as the Holy Ghost. The Lord only is mentioned there. He was the person, whom the people of Israel tempted and proved forty years—and the apostle ascribes what Jehovah spake by the Psalmist not to another person, but to the inspiration by which the Psalmist wrote as he did.

I pass for want of time over several less important text to Acts v. 3, 4, where the conduct of Ananias is called in the former verse, lying to the Holy Ghost—and in the latter verse it is declared to be lying unto God. And my

brother added with great emphasis—the Holy Ghost then is God. Certainly I reply he is, but not a distinct person from God. It was the spirit of God in the apostle, which enabled him to perceive at a glance, that Ananias had been lying, and he attributed that discovery not to his own sagacity, but to that wisdom which he had received from God.

There are several other instances, quoted by Mr. Lee of passages relating to the same event where in one, the thing is said to have been done by God and in the other by the Holy Spirit. This proves exactly the reverse of what my friend has labored so hard to establish. It proves that God and the Holy Spirit are the same person, not distinct persons—just as much as a passage that I have already quoted—"by the word of the Lord are the Heavens made and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth;" proves that the word of the Lord and the breath of his mouth are the same.

Mr. Lee next quotes 2 Tim. iii. 16. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. He then brings forward quite a number of instances in which it is said, "The word of the Lord came" to one and to another of the prophets, and then he clinches his arguments by 2 Pet. i. 21, where it is said, "the prophecy came not in old time by the will of men; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Only think of such an argument Sir, as this to establish such an incomprehensible proposition as the one he announced, that "the Holy Ghost exists personally distinct from God."

Why, sir, I should quote the passage to show that they are identically the same. If the Apostle had said, "holy men of God spake as they were moved by his spirit, or by him," the sense would have been precisely the same it is now—would it not? And yet, because our translators used the phrase, Holy Ghost, and the editors of the Bible have had the words printed with capital letter at the beginning of each, lo! we are to believe that a distinct person is spoken of. Why, sir, if I did not know Mr. Lee to be profoundly in earnest in this discussion, I should think he was trifling.

We come now to the second head of his argu-

ment. He says personal actions are, throughout the Scriptures, attributed to the Holy Ghost, Holy Spirit, and Spirit of God; and many of the same actions are elsewhere declared to have been performed by God.

Gen. i. 2, 3, in the one verse 'tis said, "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters," and in the next, "God said let there be light;" so my brother argues, here is a clear distinction of persons: one moving upon the face of the waters, the other saying, "let there be light." Does this so appear to you, Mr. chairman? His inference seems to me just as irrational as it would be to read Isa. i. 10, "Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah; and then argue that two distinct persons were here introduced—the Lord and God. But I have already, in my former speech, considered this mode of reasoning, and can only add, let every person of common sense look at it for himself, and see if there be any soundness in it.

I pass over his comment upon Ps. civ. 30, which needs no reply, and come to what he says upon Ps. ciii. 7, "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit," or, "Whither shall I flee from thy presence."

Upon this beautiful exclamation of the Psalmist, in view of the omnipresence of God, Mr. Lee remarks, "the Spirit of God, and the presence of God, are represented as two things—both are represented as everywhere." If I were disposed to make the most of this strange comment, I should say—my brother has now introduced into his Godhead another person called the "Presence of God," for there is just as much reason for contending that the "Presence of God" is a distinct person from God, as that his "Spirit" is a distinct person. I see not how God can be distinct or separate from his Spirit, any more than from his presence. It is strange that my brother, who has read the poetry of the Hebrews so much, has not observed that they often repeat precisely the same idea, in a little different form of words, so as to impress it the more deeply.

To illustrate this I opened the Psalms at random; my eye fell upon lxxxix., which is full of examples of this peculiarity. I have time but for two or three: 3d. verse, "I have made a covenant with my chosen: I have sworn unto Dav-

id my servant;" 15th verse, "Blessed is the people that know the joyful sound: they shall walk, O Lord, in the light of thy countenance;" 18th verse, "For the Lord is our defence; and the Holy One of Israel is our King."

To show my brother that the Spirit of God and the presence of God are not two things, as he says they are, I would ask him how he could go from the one without at the same instant fleeing from the other.

There is a passage, which my friend has quoted elsewhere for another purpose, which I will ask him to consider in this connexion. It is in Acts ii. 4, "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Here, according to my friend's mode of arguing from Scripture, are two persons spoken of in different parts of this verse—the Holy Ghost who filled them, and the Spirit that gave them utterance. Of course I consider one and the same influence to be here spoken of, but I see not how my brother can refuse to allow that two persons are here spoken of.

Let us pass to his next, Isa. lxi. 1, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek." Luke iv. 21, "And he began to say unto them, this day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears."

Mr. Lee asks, "what was upon him if we deny the personality of the Spirit?"

I answer, in the words of the Prophet, "The Spirit of the Lord was upon him," not the third person of the Trinity—not a third part of the substance, power and eternity of the Godhead—but the quickening, sanctifying, inspiring influence of God's Spirit.

All I have time to say upon his comment on Ezek. iii. 12-14, is, that some men, since the day of the prophet, have been borne on to the discharge of a painful and hazardous duty by a spirit hot within them; going they scarcely knew how, and sustained, as they have felt and acknowledged, by the hand of the Lord, that was strong upon them.

I come next to Mr. Lee's exposition of the Baptism of Jesus. Here he finds the three persons of the Trinity present in the same scene, in three distinct personalities, and each acting his appropriate part. The Father is head, speaking

from heaven ; the Son is coming up out of the water, where he had just been baptized ; and the Spirit of God is seen descending and lighting upon him. Here the three certainly are presented to our contemplation, so far distinct from each other that I see not how any one, who has viewed them in the attitudes in which they are here presented, can for a moment accept the doctrine which my friend attempts to support. How can he now ask any one to believe that the being who was sitting invisible in the heavens above, was the being who, in the form of a man, was coming up out of the water where he had been baptized, and also the afflatus which, in the flickering motion of a descending dove, was seen to come down from above and alight upon him : that each was the infinite and eternal God—the same that was sitting aloft in the heavens—the same, too, as the humble man upon whom that afflatus was alighting, and that all three were no more than either one.

But the foregoing is not so unfortunate for his argument as the next which he adduces. Matt. iv. 1, "Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the Devil."

"Here," said Mr. Lee, "the Spirit performed a personal action." My friend could not have stopped to consider the nature of this action, or he would not have attributed it to the Holy Spirit, whom he professes to believe was the very and eternal God. Now, sir, "God." I say it in the words of an Apostle, "cannot be tempted of evil, neither tempteth he any man," and yet Mr. Lee has alleged that the being whom he calls the Holy Ghost, led Jesus up into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil. Surely, then, he must have been a being wholly distinct and for ever separate from God, else how could he have plotted with the spirit of wickedness to bring Jesus into temptation ? I must leave Mr. Lee to reconcile this as he can. The passage fails every way to give any support to his proposition—not only so, but suggests new difficulties, which it will be impossible for him to surmount without retracing some of his steps.

But my time is out, so nearly, that I can only say a word upon a passage, that I have already referred to.

Rom. viii. 16, "The spirit itself beareth wit-

ness with our spirits, that we are the children of God."

Here, sir, the translators of our English Bible have given us the neuter pronouns, and we see the propriety of it. But how would it answer, as I have said before, to refer to God by a neuter pronoun ? The propriety of speaking of the spirit in this way, and the impropriety that all would see in speaking of God as "it," shows that the one is always a person, and the other may be a property, an attribute, a manifestation of his mind or will.

NINTH EVENING—MARCH 16.

MR. LEE'S FIRST SPEECH.

Before proceeding directly with a review of Mr. May's replies to my arguments, I will add a word about the work by Mr. Sears. In reply to my quotations from that work against Mr. May's views, he told you that he circulated a large number of copies of it among his people. He does not believe its teachings, he says, but he gives them all the influence he is able. Is this because he would keep his own views out of sight, and make the impression that these are his views ? He may circulate the Bible on the same principle, for aught we know, unless he assures us to the contrary.

Mr. May's long effort on the etymology of the word Spirit, was a waste of time, unless he thought to divert attention by it.

I admit that it means air, wind, breath, respiration, life, animation, disposition, &c.

But it has none of these senses when the Spirit of God is spoken of.

It also means the human soul : but it does not mean the soul when the Spirit of God, Holy Spirit, or Holy Ghost, is meant.

Now the only question is, what does the word mean when the Spirit of God is the subject of remark ?

Mr. May said—It means influence.

Mr. Lee—What is influence ? Can any man tell me what it is, except another name for exerted power, physical or moral, of which we can have no idea aside from an operative agent, or personality.

If we were to render it as Mr. May proposes, in some cases "wind of God," it would not help his argument or impair mine. It becoming a name of something would as clearly imply personality as the Holy Ghost does.

It would read oddly to translate, "The wind of God, like a dove, descended upon him."

"He that shall blaspheme the wind of God."

Still, the wind of God, as a proper name, would be just as descriptive of personality as Holy Ghost.

The wind of God, could not be God himself, any more than the Spirit of God is God himself.

II. Mr. May's criticism on the Greek word, *pneuma*, and its pronouns, was equally unfortunate for him, as it is wholly unsound.

The word *pneuma*, the Greek word rendered Spirit, signifies breathing, breath, respiration, a blast, gale, air, wind. It is derived from *pneo*, to blow. It also signifies any spirit, good or bad; the soul of man, the Spirit of God.

Mr. May contended, that as it is a neuter noun, it cannot represent personality, and that its pronouns are also neuter, and should not be translated by "it," and not by "he," as is the case in our English version. I am sorry to be compelled to expose so many of my friends Greek criticisms, but the cause of truth demands it.

The facts are these: the noun *pneuma*, is neuter, and it could be nothing else, as its first sense is breath, air, wind. It necessarily retains its neuter form when used to denote God himself. But if this proves anything to Mr. May's purpose, it proves that God is neuter, and that he should be represented by the neuter pronoun, it. I will give but one illustration of this point.

"God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." John iv. 24.

Here the neuter noun, *pneuma*, is used to express the nature or essence of God. *Pneumo ho Theos*, God is a spirit. Now, according to Mr. May's criticism it should have a neuter pronoun and be represented by "it."

Mr. May said—I did not say so.

Mr. Lee continued—That is, Mr. May's God is an *it*.

Now let us look at the word and its pronouns as it is used to denote the Holy Ghost.

"And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever." John xiv. 16.

This other comforter is the Holy Ghost. Now observe—

1. This word *parakletos*, rendered comforter is a masculine noun, and is represented by the pronoun *he*.

Now, according to Mr. May's own argument, the Holy Ghost is represented as a personality, by a masculine noun being employed to denote him. Mr. May argued that the presence of a neuter pronoun proved that the Holy Ghost was not a person. Now, if the want of the masculine pronoun proves the absence of personality, then the presence of the masculine, as here, proves by parity of reasoning, that the Holy Ghost is a personality. The first name, borrowed from nature as the best emblem of the Spirit, in itself invisible and incomprehensible, is necessarily neuter, but when the same spirit is described by another name, that is masculine. This proves the personality.

The difficulty in this matter is this. There is a great meagreness in our language which requires that illustrations be employed taken from things already understood. God himself cannot convey to us any distinct idea of heaven, without employing as illustrations the excellent things of earth.

2. This *parakletoς* is another comforter, placing the Holy Ghost on a parallel with Christ, and making the Spirit an exchange for him. Christ was a personality, a personal comforter; the Holy Ghost was another comforter, which must involve the same personality.

3. The very name itself implies a personal existence. *Parakletoς*, signifies a comforter, guide, monitor, instructor, helper and advocate.

It occurs but five times in the New Testament; four times it is applied to the Holy Ghost, and once to Christ.

"If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father. 1st John. ii. 1.

"But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John xiv. 26.

He shall teach you—"he" *ekeinos*, is here masculine.

"But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, *he* shall testify of me: And ye also shall hear

witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." John xv. 26, 27.

1. Here the pronoun *ekeinos*, "he," is in the masculine.

2. *He* shall testify of me, and *ye* also shall bear witness. They were personal witnesses, *he* and *ye*.

" Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the *Comforter* will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." John xvi. 7.

Here the pronoun *outon* rendered *he*, is in the masculine.

By these few illustrations you may see what ground Mr. May had to affirm that these pronouns are in the neuter gender in the Greek, and that they should be so rendered.

This brief exhibit has been made out during the day, and rests upon a personal examination of the texts quoted. If Mr. May is disposed to question my correctness or truth, I will refer him to Bishop Heber's Bampton Lectures on the personality of the Holy Ghost, Lecture 2d, where the point in issue is fully discussed, and my view maintained, and where the Bishop asserts that no man with the slightest acquaintance with the Greek will deny that the pronouns are in the masculine gender.

Now, as Mr. May is a great admirer of the poets, and considers them inspired, I hope he will accept him as testimony in this case!

Mr. May—I admire him, as a poet, very much!

III. In his own exposition of the Holy Ghost, he was no more fortunate than in his criticism.

He says it is God himself, or some one of his attributes.

This will not do, as was shown in my argument, which he has not answered.

Take the texts already quoted as examples—"But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name." John xiv. 26.

God sends the Comforter.

Does he send himself?

Does he send one of his attributes?

He sends the Comforter in the name of Christ. Does he send himself in the name of one of his creatures, a mere man, as Mr. May affirms Christ to be?

MR. MAY'S FIRST SPEECH.

If Mr. Lee had reminded you of all that I have said respecting the holy spirit, you would have seen that the remarks, he has just now made, were wholly inapplicable. I have alluded again and again to the fact, that in some instances the holy spirit is spoken of as a person, by that figure of speech called by rhetoricians *personification*, just as wisdom is personified in the 8th of Proverbs. I deny that the holy spirit of God is a distinct person, or has a distinct personality, just as much as I deny that his wisdom, or his word has such personality; but I have never denied, that the holy spirit, the word and the wisdom of God are sometimes *personified*. This is all the reply that I deem it necessary to make to what he has said on this point. You will see for yourselves what I have said heretofore, in the published Report of this discussion.

My friend expresses surprise, that I should have distributed so many copies of Sears on Regeneration among the families of my Church. He thinks it very inconsistent, unprincipled in me to have encouraged the reading o' a book, in which there are what I deem such false doctrines. Mr. Lee cannot have read the book, or his surprise would have abated. I grant there are some objectionable things in that book, so objectionable that I hesitated some time whether to make the use of it, that I have done. But my doubt was overborne by the great amount of truth that I found in the book, most clearly and beautifully expressed.

My opponent has really spoken, once or twice, as if he had unmasked me, dragged me out of my hiding-place. Why, Sir, I have been as much above-board, and out-spoken, as a man could be, ever since I lived in this city. I have no opinions to conceal. I came not into this discussion to keep back any thing pertaining to the subject; but to get as many of my thoughts out as could be uttered in the time allowed me. I am anxious to let the community know all my sentiments and purposes, and to interest as many in them as I may be able to.

The nature of the conception of Jesus Christ, whether natural or super-natural really had nothing to do with the subject of this discussion, still I did not hesitate when called upon to give my belief upon that point. I gave it promptly on the spot; and then on the following evening gave my reasons for my opinion. I formerly believed in the miraculous conception. I do not now, for the weight of evidence appears to

me to be against the fact. But if new proof should be brought forward in favor of it, I may be brought to believe it again; for I have no wish but to receive the truth. If Mr. Sears does believe in the miraculous conception, that is no reason why I should refuse the good there is in his book. A large proportion of Unitarians believe the same; all the Arrians of course believe it, and ever have. Yet they have never seen and do not now see in that fact, any evidence of the deity of Christ; for other men have been supernaturally born.

Mr. Lee is very much troubled that I should distribute a book, in which there are some errors. Why, Sir, what book can he point me to, that is wholly free from them. The Bible itself has errors in it. Not only are the headings of the chapters often misrepresentations of the contents; and the divisions into chapters and verses so badly made as to obscure the sense; but there are words, and passages if not chapters in it, that are spurious. Nor is this all, but the undoubted truths of the Copernican system of Astronomy, and of the science of Geology, are, or seem to be, contradicted.

But notwithstanding these imperfections and errors, I believe the Bible contains more and higher truths on the most important of all subjects, than any other book; therefore I circulate it, and earnestly recommend the reading of it; nay, more, the careful and thorough study of its pages. And I have not a doubt, that if the Bible were studied more and the creeds less, there would not be so much regard amongst men for the theologies of the churches, but a great deal more regard for the requirement of true Religion.

Mr. Lee, last evening, not only called in question the authority, on which I intimated my belief, that the original history of the Gospel by Mathew contained no account of the miraculous conception of Jesus; but he attempted by certain quotations from the Apostolic Fathers, to lead you to suppose, that they and the primitive church held views of the nature of Christ, similar to his own, though he did not tell you, that even he cannot find, in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, the slightest intimation of the Deity of the Holy Ghost.

I am so happy as to have in my library most of the authorities, to which my friend referred, and I shall therefore tell you what I have learnt from the same and other sources.

The first disciples of Christ were from among

the Jews. They were versed in the knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures, but knew little and cared less for the philosophies of Greece, or of the oriental world. They received Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ or Messiah long expected by their nation, because they were impressed by the divine wisdom that came from his lips, and were astonished at the wonderful works that God did by him. Moreover they had become satisfied, that the Hebrew prophecies concerning the Messiah, properly understood, were fulfilled in Jesus, and that the kingdom he came to establish was not an earthly dominion as had been erroneously supposed, but the reign of truth, righteousness and love. As was very natural, they retained their attachment to the religious ceremonies and holy times that had been observed by their forefathers under Moses. To this the Apostles made no objections, excepting when they attempted to enforce these things upon those, who were converted to Christ from among the Gentiles.

These primitive disciples were called Ebionites and Nazarines, both of these names probably given at first in contempt; the former meaning poor, low, unlearned persons; and the latter being derived from the obscure, despised village of Gallilee, where Jesus had always lived. There has been, and still is, some dispute amongst theologians whether the two names were given to the first Christians indiscriminately; or whether they were differing sects. Some maintain that they were—others insist that the Nazarines were the older class and believed in the miraculous conception of Jesus, though they had no thought of his being Jehovah incarnate, any more than other men who had been supernaturally born. And that the Ebionites degenerated from them into the disbelief of the miraculous conception, and withal became more strenuous for a pharisaic observance of the rites and ceremonies prescribed by Moses. This is the account of the matter given by their enemies. But it seems to me, that the historians do not bear them out in just such a statement of the facts. Mosheim, in his learned Commentaries on the History of Christianity for the first Three Centuries, Vol. I. p. 401, allows "that at that early period the denomination of Ebionites was applied indiscriminately to all such Jews, as notwithstanding their conversion to Christianity, continued to observe the law of Moses." M. Gieseler's Text Book to Ecclesiastical History,—a work very highly commended by the orthodox professors

at Andover, Princeton, and the Baptist Theological Institution at Newton,—Gieseler, Vol. I. page 62, says “Ever since the council of the Apostles at Jerusalem, (Act xv.,) there had always been a difference of opinion on the subject then discussed, which led at length to an entire separation: some adhering to the views of the Apostles (Nazarines) whilst the other party maintained that the Christian converts were bound to observe the whole Mosaic law, and that Jesus was the Son of Joseph and Mary. These last were called Ebionites, *which seems to have been originally a term of derision applied by the Jews to all Christians alike.*”

But what is more significant of the probable truth on this point is, that Eusebius, the father of Ecclesiastical History, who flourished about the beginning of the fourth century, and was accounted the most learned man of his time,—Eusebius speaks only of the *Ebionites*, making no mention whatever of the Nazarines.

“These are properly called Ebionites by the ancients, as those who cherished low and mean opinions of Christ. For they considered him a plain and common man, and justified only by his advances in virtue; and that he was born of the Virgin Mary, by natural generation. With them the observance of the law was altogether necessary, as if they could not be saved, only by faith in Christ and a corresponding life. Others, however, besides these, but of the same name, indeed avoided the absurdity of the opinions maintained by the former, not denying that the Lord was born of the Virgin of the Holy Ghost, and yet in like manner, not acknowledging his pre-existence; though he was God, the word and wisdom, they turned aside into the same irreligion, as with the former they evinced great zeal to observe the ritual service of the law.” Eusebius p. 112.

“The Ebionites,” says Irenaeus, “make use of the gospel of Matthew only.” Jerome, who died A. D. 430 at 80, had seen this Gospel, and translated it from Hebrew into Greek; and without giving his own opinion, says, that “it was by most persons called the authentic Gospel of Matthew. Theodoret, (A. D. 460,) a Christian father and an ecclesiastical historian, says concerning both kinds of Ebionites, that they received no other Gospel than that of Matthew. And they did not consider the two first chapters as belonging to the Gospel. Epiphanius says “the Gospel of the Ebionites began thus, “It came to pass in the days of

Herod, king of Judea, in the time of Caiaphas, the high priest, a person whose name was John came baptising with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan.” This is just where Mark and John commence their narrative. (The above facts are from Dr. Priestley’s History of Early Opinions.)

The probability is, that none of the first Christians, called Ebionites or Nazarines, believed in the miraculous conception. But that after a while a part of them, known from the others by the name of Nazarines, came to believe this account of his birth. It was one of a great many marvellous stories which, at that early age, were in circulation respecting the birth and childhood of Jesus. All the rest of them were laid aside as apocryphal, by the framers of the canon of the New Testament Scriptures; and are preserved in a volume called the Apocryphal New Testament, of which here is a copy. The account of the miraculous conception was deemed by them no doubt authentic. It is well known however that, if the Nazarines did believe in our Saviour’s supernatural birth, *they did not believe in his deity, or pre-existence.*

What was the faith, the system of belief held by the first Christians, is pretty well known. It resembled very nearly that which we still possess in what is called the Apostles’ Creed, if indeed that creed did not originate with them. Little more of its history is known, than that it was the most ancient. Some eminent Trinitarian theologians have attempted to make it appear, that the Nazarines’ belief respecting the nature of Christ was similar to their own. But we have from Mosheim, one of the most learned, careful and candid of ecclesiastical historians, though himself orthodox, the following explicit acknowledgment: “None of all the proofs adduced from ancient authors can be said so far to establish the fact (that the Nazarines believed in the deity of Christ) as to leave no room for doubt. Manifest indeed it is that the Nazarines regarded our Blessed Lord as of a higher and more exalted nature than a mere man; and that they looked upon him as having been begotten of a virgin by the omnipotent will of the Deity, and admitted him to be in a certain sense, the Son of God, endowed with divine power. But whether they believed him to have had an existence prior to Mary, and that God and man were united in his person, admits of very considerable doubt. In

fact, the sense of all the passages that have been brought forward by men of erudition, with a view to establish this, is very uncertain and equivocal. On the contrary, there are some passages in ancient authors which appear to furnish sufficient proof of the Nazarines having denied the divinity of Christ." Mosheim's Commentaries Vol. I. p. 403.

Dr. Priestley, of whom no one will presume to speak contemptuously, unless it be one who is utterly ignorant of his researches into early ecclesiastical history, which were more extensive and profound than those of any other man of his day, certainly not excepting Dr. Horsey, if we may judge from their controversy,—Dr. Priestley shows, by an abundance of quotations from the Christian Fathers, that, at most, the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ had not been preached before the writing of St. John's Gospel which was more than thirty-five, if not more than forty-five years after the ascension; and consequently that before that time the great body of the earliest Christians must have been Unitarians; and there is no evidence that any of them were denounced as heretics, much less excommunicated on that account. Hear also the testimony of Mosheim:

"The Christian system, as it was hitherto taught, preserved its native and beautiful simplicity, and was comprehended in a small number of articles. The public teachers inculcated no other doctrines, than those that are contained in what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed. And in the method of illustrating them, all vain subtleties, all mysterious researches, every thing that was beyond the reach of common capacities, were carefully avoided. This will by no means appear surprising to those who consider, that, at this time, there was not the least controversy about those capital doctrines of Christianity, which were afterwards so keenly debated in the church; and who reflect, that the bishops of these primitive times were, for the most part, plain and illiterate men, remarkable rather for their piety and zeal than for their learning and eloquence." Mosheim's History Vol. I. page 183.

Now it is a very significant fact, that although the Nazarines were Unitarians no less than the Ebionites, or certainly did not believe in the deity of Christ, they were never classed as heretics by the most ancient ecclesiastical writers. Indeed Epiphanius, who flourished near the end of the fourth century, is the first who gives them that bad name. This fact is all the more signifi-

cant in its bearing upon the subject of this discussion, because those who came to be distinguished from them under the name of Ebionites, were condemned, because they would not admit that any miraculous conceptions attended the birth of Jesus, but maintained that he was the Son of Joseph and Mary; and because they insisted, that it was requisite for every one, who would obtain favor with God, that he should strictly observe all the ceremonial laws of Moses. The condemnation of the Ebionites was therefore, in effect, the approval of the Nazarines.

Throughout the whole of the first century, there appears to have been no idea started among the Christians, that bore any resemblance to that of the Deity of Christ, much less of a trinity of persons in the Godhead.

I think I have shown in the course of our discussion that there is nothing in the canonical books of the New Testament, which would imply the Trinity, to a mind not already trained to believe the doctrine. And of the apocryphal writings of the first hundred years after the death of Christ, those which were nearest to the age of the Apostles, and are of the highest authority have least in them, that favors the introduction of this cardinal error.

The Apostles' Creed, to which I have already referred, is exceedingly to my purpose, on this point. From the fourth century downwards, for many hundred years, it was generally thought to have been composed by the Apostles. This opinion I believe is generally abandoned by the learned. (See King's History of the Apostles' Creed 4th chap. p. 25.) Still its great antiquity is not denied; cannot be doubted; "or that it is a work of nearly apostolic importance. Hear it that you may know what was the belief of the Primitive Church.

"I believe in God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth: and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the holy ghost (spirit) born of the virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried; he descended into hell (the grave); the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty: from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

"I believe in the Holy Ghost (spirit); the holy Catholic (general) Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen."

Where is there in this creed, Sir, any imita-

tion of a trinity of persons in the Godhead? Yet this was the formula of the Christian faith in most of the churches until in A. D. 325, it was supplanted by the Nicene Creed.

Mr. Lee, last evening, quoted the writings of Clement and Polycarp; and I readily admit, that they are the two men of all others, belonging to the age immediately succeeding the Apostolic, whose writings may be relied upon, in forming our opinion concerning the doctrine in question.

My friend, last evening, would have led you to suppose, by the quotations, which he made, that these two Christian fathers, believe Jesus Christ to be God in the same sense, that modern Trinitarians believe that doctrine. But I expect to show you that the language of these Fathers agrees very much with that of the New Testament, clearly distinguishing God from his son and servant Jesus Christ. They do not contain a sentence which ascribes supreme deity to our Saviour—much less one, that ascribes distinct personality to the Holy Ghost.

I must decline however to follow Mr. Lee through the Epistles of Ignatius, much more through the Visions of Hermas. For as it respects the first named, excellent as was the character and exalted the position of Ignatius, so much doubt hangs over his epistles, as to which of those that bear his name were really written by him; and then of those that are supposed to have been his, they have been so much interpolated, that we cannot know, if we turn to his epistles, whether we are reading his words or not. I need only read to you what is said by Mosheim, to show you, that we should not attempt to settle any question about the opinions of the primitive Christians, by an appeal to writings, over which there hangs so much doubt.

"There are yet extant several epistles, attributed to him, concerning the authenticity of which there have been, however, tedious and warm disputes among the learned, which still subsist. Of these epistles, seven are said to have been written by this eminent martyr, during his journey from Antioch to Rome; and these the most of learned men acknowledge to be genuine, as they stand in the edition that was published in the last century, from a manuscript in the Mecicean library. The others are generally rejected as spurious. As to my own sentiments of this matter, though I am willing to adopt this opinion as preferable to any other, yet I cannot help looking upon the authenticity

of the Epistle to Polycarp as extremely dubious, on account of the difference of style: and, indeed, the whole question, relating to the epistles of St. Ignatius in general, seems to me to labor under much obscurity, and to be embarrassed with many difficulties." Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, Vol. I. 112.

And as to the visions of Hermas, from which Mr. Lee quoted several passages last evening, only hear, Sir, what Mosheim says of him, and I am sure you will not blame me for refusing to spend time in examining his pages. Comment, Vol. I. p. 209, "There is such an admixture of folly and superstition with piety,—such a ridiculous association of the most egregious nonsense with things momentous and useful, not only in the celestial visions, which constitute the substance of his first book, but also in the precepts and parables which are put into the mouth of the Angel in the two others,—as to render it a matter of astonishment, that men of learning should ever have thought of giving Hermas a place among the inspired writers. To me it appears clear, that he must have been either a wild, disordered fanatic, or else, as is more likely, a man who, by way of more readily drawing the attention of his brethren to certain maxims and precepts, which he deemed just and salutary, conceived himself to be warranted in pretending to have derived them from conversations with God and angels."

MR. LEE'S SECOND SPEECH.

I will now resume my notice of Mr. May's review of the argument respecting the Holy Ghost. It is said :

"But when the comforter is come whom, I will send unto you from the Father even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father."—John xv. 26.

Christ here says he will send the comforter. Does Christ a mere man send God his creator?

My friend says that Christ is a mere man. He also says that the Holy Ghost is God the Father. Then does it follow that Christ sends God the Father according to my friend's argument. And this text is made to mean that Jesus Christ a mere man sends God out from himself.

IV. His reply, that the Spirit of God does not imply a personality, and that actions said to be performed by the spirit of God do not imply a distinct personality any more than we imply a distinct personality when we speak of

the spirit of a man, is entirely fallacious—a mere sophism.

Man is a compound being consisting of a body and a soul; and when we speak of the spirit of a man, the mind of a man &c., we have reference to this distinction.

In the very philosophy of language, when we speak of any thing or quality as of man, or of God, neither man nor God is or can be meant as an entirety. The preposition "of," has but two significations; a principal sense which is, coming out of or proceeding from or subsisting by as the cause; and a derivative sense denoting possession, as belonging to it. When we say the spirit of a man we mean, and are understood to mean something possessed by the man, or belonging to the man. When we say the Spirit of God we do not mean that, nor can the language of the Scriptures be construed fairly to mean any such thing. It expresses a relation, which involves a distinction between the relatives.

V. His attempt to dispose of the matter on the score of figures of speech was equally fruitless.

He talked of the hand of God, the finger of God; and he might have talked of the arm of God.

These are figures of speech. But it is no figure of speech when it is said the Holy Ghost descended upon Christ. Or in this case.

"Baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

God has no hands fingers and arms, in a literal sense; but he has a spirit, and there is a Holy Ghost that has more than a figurative existence.

VII. The small force that his reply appeared to have depended upon a misrepresentation of my position, effected by a change of language. In speaking of my personal distinction in the Godhead he constantly said; distinct, or "personally distinct from God.

I used no such language.

Mr. May said—May I ask what your distinction is?

My distinction is, a distinction of persons in the Godhead, not distinct from God. He seems to be incapable of reasoning at all on the subject without confounding my personal distinction in the Godhead with a personal distinction

of the Holy Ghost from God, which is a creature of his own brain!

VIII. His attempt to confound my view by representing my arguments as making five elements in the Godhead was trifling for a man of sense. Hear it. The Father Son and Holy Ghost make three; and he represented that the human body, and soul of Christ make two more!

Well now had he nothing else to say?

The human body and soul of Christ do not exist in the unity of the Godhead. The humanity is united to the Logos, but not to the Father or the Holy Ghost.

I have said nothing which implies any such thing.

It was a chimera of his own, got up to divert attention or something like that.

VIII. His attempt to explain away the force of the texts I quoted was ineffectual.

The above refutations and explanations leave his expositions of texts nothing to stand upon, I will notice one or two or them.

It may be observed that he finds it convenient to notice only a part of my arguments and proof texts.

In his attempted replies he has skipped about from one to another. Why is this? Certain texts and certain arguments he seems to prefer noticing, far more than he does certain other texts and arguments.

The exposition he gave of the Baptismal scene described in Matt. iii. 16, 17, claims notice.

He did not explain this. He represented it as an absurdity to suppose that all three were God, as though I made three Gods.

Now while he denies the representation I gave as the true one, he does not attempt to tell you what the Holy Ghost was, that descended like a dove. But I have proved to you by arguments he has not even attempted to answer, that Jesus Christ was God and that the Holy Ghost was God, that there is three in the unity of one Godhead. But he seems determined to misconceive my views and mistake my language.

Matt. 41. "Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit."

He did not explain this and show that it meant something else, but contradicted it.

The point is that the Spirit led him. Mr. May denies that the Spirit led him.

And you will remember that he made great ado over this matter, as one who had gained much spoil. To him the idea that Christ was led up "of the spirit" to be tempted of the Devil, was exceedingly horrible. Now the question simply is this. Was he led of the Spirit, or was he not? Mr. May says it cannot be. The Evangelist says he was. So then Mr. May says one thing and the Evangelist another. And just so he has shown himself, ready to deny any thing that he cannot meet any other way.

That it was really the Holy Ghost is plain from Luke iv. 1-3. "And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness, Being forty days tempted of the devil. And in those days he did eat nothing; and when they were ended, he afterward hungered. And the devil said unto him, If thou be the Son of God, command this stone that it be made bread."

Perhaps Mr. May does not believe that there is a devil. I have some doubts about his believing it.

He quoted from James i. 13. "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man."

He reasoned as though the Holy Ghost or God was the tempter.

His being led by the Spirit was not a temptation. The devil alone tempted him, not the Holy Ghost or God.

I am entirely surprised that he saw not that distinction. For lack of proper discrimination his remarks amounted to nothing.

I have now but a few minutes remaining. I will fill up the remainder by reading from Eusebius:

"As the mode of existence in Christ is two-fold, the one resembling the head of the body, indicating his divinity; the other compared to the feet, by which he, for the sake of our salvation, assumed that nature which is subject to the same infirmities with ourselves: hence our account of the subsequent matter may be rendered complete and perfect, by commencing with the principal and most important points in his history.

"For who but the Father hath thoroughly understood that Light which existed before

the world was—that intellectual and substantial wisdom, and that living Word which in the beginning was with the Father, before all creation and any production visible or invisible, the first and only offspring of God, the prince and leader of the spiritual and immortal host of heaven, the angel of the mighty council, the agent to execute the Father's secret will, the maker of all things with the Father, the second cause of the universe next to the Father, the true and only Son of the Father, and the Lord and God and King of all created things, who has received power, and dominion with divinity itself, and power and honor from the Father. All this is evident from those more abstruse passages in reference to his divinity, "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God." "All things were made by him, and without him nothing was made." This, too, we are taught by the great Moses, that most ancient of all the prophets, when under the influence of the divine Spirit, he describes the creation and arrangement of all things, he also informs us that the Creator and maker of the universe yielded to Christ, and to none but to his divine and first begotten word, the formation of all subordinate things, and communed with him respecting the creation of man. "For," says he, "God said let us make man according to our image and according to our likeness."

"Of Him, Moses obviously speaks as the second after the Father, when he says, "The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord." Him also again appearing to Jacob in the form of man, the sacred Scriptures call by the name of God, saying to Jacob, "Thy name shall no longer be called Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name, because thou hast prevailed with God." Whence also Jacob called the name of that place the vision of God, saying, "I have seen God face to face, and my soul has lived."

"He appeared in a human body, in substance not differing from our own nature, at the commencement of the Roman empire; performed and suffered such things as were to follow, according to prophecy viz, that *man and God*, the author of miraculous works, would dwell in the world, and would be exhibited to all the nations as the teacher of that piety which the Father will approve. In these prophecies, also, were foretold the extraordinary fact of his birth, his new doctrine, and his wonderful works; as also the manner of his death, his resurrection from the dead, and finally his divine return to the heavens.

"His power is an everlasting power, which shall not pass away; and his kingdom shall not be destroyed. These passages can evidently be referred to no one but to our Saviour, that God word which was in the beginning with God; called the Son of God, by reason of his final appearance in the flesh.

" And not only Isaiah but David also, addressing him, says, ' Thy throne, O God, is from everlasting to everlasting. A sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity. Therefore hath God, thy God, anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.' In which words, he calls him God in the first verse; and in the second he ascribes to him the royal sceptre, and thus proceeding after the divine and royal power, in the third place, he represents him as Christ, anointed not by the oil of material substances, but by the divine oil of gladness.

" In addition to all these, as the pre-existing word of God, coming into existence before all ages, and who has received the honors of worship, he is also adored as God; but what is most remarkable, is the fact, that we who are consecrated to him, honor him not only with the voice and sound of words, but with all the affections of the mind; so that we prefer giving a testimony to him, even to the preservation of our own lives."

MR. MAY'S SECOND SPEECH.

I wonder if my arguments appear as strangely, and seem as inconsistent and unmeaning when I deliver them, as they do when they are reflected from Mr. Lee's mind. Why, sir, I do not know my own bantlings. I can only aver that I am not conscious of avoiding in my replies those parts of his arguments that have been particularly cogent, or those passages of scripture that have presented the greatest difficulties for me to resolve. Until the last time I have been obliged to follow him as well as I could, and save as many as I have been able of his arguments and of his proof texts, in order to prepare my replies. And I can only say, that I have endeavored to seize upon his strong posts, and by carrying them overthrow the whole.

My friend recurs often to what he states as a fact, that I regard Jesus as *a mere man*.—But, sir, that happens not to be the fact. I regard him as a man "anointed by God," a man to whom God gave "his spirit not by measure." I believe, too, that he was perfect in his character. Mr. Lee has allowed more than once, that all I have said of the proofs of the humanity of Jesus was true, and that he believed him to be a man as much as I did. The only dispute then between us, is, not about his being a man, but about the nature and extent of his union with God.

My friend would make light of what I said about the baptismal scene, and the temptation of Jesus. Sir, if I know everwhen an impression is made upon an audience, I know that an impression was made upon many, who heard what I said upon each of those subjects. Many here felt with me, at least for the moment, that the baptismal scene was a very unfortunate exhibition of the sort of union of the Father, Son and Spirit, for which my friend is here contending.

But Mr. Lee comes and sets aside all I said, by pronouncing it unmeaning or not pertinent, and passes sentence with so much assurance that for a moment I almost think he must be right; for how can a man be so confident if he is not surely right?

Let me, however, ask you to look again at what I said about the temptation of Christ.—Mr. Lee quoted the text Math. iv. 1. "Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil"—he quoted this to prove that the Holy Spirit must be a person, because here was a personal act said to have been done by him. My comment upon that text was this, and I see not how he can evade its force. If the Spirit here spoken of led up Jesus to be tempted of the Devil, he could not have been the Holy Spirit or God himself; because God tempteth no man.

Mr. Lee. Well then, what do you understand by the temptation of Jesus? What spirit did lead him up to be tempted?

Mr. M. He was tempted like as we are.—Every man is tempted, when he is led away by his own desires, or purposes. Sometimes he is carried too far by those, that are in themselves good. This subject really has nothing to do with the proposition we are discussing; but I will say a few words more upon it, even if I am obliged to omit some things more to our present purpose.

When Jesus found himself ordained, anointed to do the work of the long expected Messiah, he was overwhelmed by the weight of the commission. His Spirit longed to be alone where he might hold undisturbed communion with himself and his God. He sought the complete retirement of some lonely place in the wilderness country. In his intentness upon his high purpose, he thought not of the wants

of his body; made no provision for them, and went far away from the habitations of men with nothing to supply them. He continued there, as I suppose, in meditation and prayer, forty days subsisting as far as he could upon the scanty food that the wilderness afforded. Until at last he became exhausted by the intense action of his spirit, and hungry for the food of his body. Then it was that the temptations came to him to use his miraculous powers for the supply of his wants, and to escape the trials that awaited him. And he cast them all behind him. But I have not time now to describe to you what I suppose those temptations were.

The idea which Mr. Lee seems to have of this occurrence is shocking to me. That the Holy Spirit, who was as he believes God himself, should have led Jesus up.

For the reasons, which I gave you, when I was last up, I shall pass by unnoticed all the quotations made by Mr. Lee from Ignatius and Hermas, and recall your attention only to the writings of Clement and Polycarp.

Clement was probably a disciple of St. Peter and a Bishop of Rome. At one time he was had in such reverence, that his epistles to the Corinthians were introduced into the canon of the New Testament. I shall now quote from his Epistle,—the same to which Mr. Lee referred, and show you that that early Father did not believe the deity of Christ, and had not a thought of the distinct personality and deity of the Holy Spirit.

Epistle Ch. I. verse 1.—“The Church of God which is at Rome, to the Church of God which is at Corinth, elect, sanctified by the will of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord; grace and peace from the Almighty God, by Jesus Christ be multiplied unto you.”

Ch. XI. 16. “Let us consider, beloved, how the Lord does continually show us, that there shall be a future resurrection, of which he has made our Lord Jesus Christ the first fruits, raising him from the dead.”

Ch. XIV. 1. “Wherefore, we being a part of the Holy one, let us do all those things that pertain unto holiness.”

Ch. XIX. 1. “The Apostles have preached to us from our Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ

from God. Christ therefore was sent by God, and the Apostles by Christ.”

Ch. XX. 16. “Have we not all one God, and one Christ? Is not one spirit of grace poured out upon us all? Have we not one calling in Christ?”

Polycarp flourished A. D. 108. He had been a disciple of St. John, and appointed by him Bishop of the Church of Smyrna. No one will deny that he is a high authority on the point in question. Hear a few quotations from his Epistle to the Philippians.

Chap. I. 1. “Polycarp, and the presbyters that are with him, to the church of God which is at Philippi: mercy unto you and peace, from God Almighty, and the Lord Jesus Christ our Savior, be multiplied, (6 verse,) believing in him that raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and hath given him glory, and a throne at his right hand.”

I need quote no more from his Epistle for there is not an expression in it on this subject, that intimates any other idea of Christ than his subordination to the Father.

The historian Neander has given an account of the Martyrdom of Polycarp. He was burnt at the stake. Before the fire was lighted—he prayed thus:—“O Lord, almighty God the Father of thy beloved son Jesus Christ, through whom we have received a knowledge of thee! * * I thank thee that thou hast thought me worthy this day, and this hour; to share the cup of thy Christ, among the number of thy witnesses.”—History page 66.

The reproach of the cross impelled many of the early Jewish Christians, to favor any thing that should show their Lord and master to have been a marvellous, supernatural being. One of the first heresies condemned by the apostles was that, which taught that Jesus Christ was a spirit, who had not a real body of flesh—and therefore did not actually (but only in appearance) suffer upon the cross. So, too, tales were told, and believed by many, of the wonderful, miraculous powers exercised by Jesus while yet a little child. Epithets—titles of great respect and dignity were bestowed upon him; but wherever the name of God is given him, it is manifest from the connexion, that it is bestowed in a subordinate sense, as it had been customary among the Jews to use it.

The doctrine of the Trinity did not originate with the Jews—nor with the Jewish christians. Their Christ was a divinely commissioned man of pre-eminent excellence as an individual; of supernatural gifts as Messiah.—They had no thought about pre-existence, or super-angelic nature. As a whole, those earliest Christians had not begun to speculate—they knew nothing of metaphysics. The immaculate conception even as we have seen many of them denied. Their faith seems to have been simple and free from mysticism; such as we still have it in what is called the Apostle's Creed.

I have adduced these testimonies that you might be assured, that the Deity of our Savior was not believed by those who learnt Christianity from his apostles and their immediate successors. Indeed it was not heard of until mystics from the East, and philosophers from the West, with the kindest intentions no doubt, consented to incorporate Christianity into their systems.

"The great mystery of Divine existence, as has been repeatedly demonstrated, if it be true, is not the great mystery of the Gospel. In the annals of Egyptian mythology we read of the unalterable union of Uneph, Phtha, and Neith. and the Hindoos, had their Brahma, Vishnu and Siva—quite as incomprehensible trinities as that which has been allowed to obscure the light and confound the wisdom of the christian world." The great purpose of the Mosaic dispensation, developed and perfected as it was in the Gospel of Christ was to establish in the hearts of men, the sublime doctrine of the perfect unity of God, and the paternity—the fathery kindness—of his character.

This great avowed purpose of what the Christian world professes to revere as the divine revelations recorded in our Bible, has been in a large measure thwarted, by the corruptions that were too early engrafted upon the religion of Christ from the philanthropic schools of Greece, Egypt and Asia.

"At Alexandria in Egypt, about the time of our Savior, lived Philo Judæus—a deep scholar, in an age when deep scholarship was virtue—and a profound philosopher, after the fashion of that day, when every thinker was a theorizer. Living in a city (at that time the

great centre of the commercial world) a city filled to overflowing with every form of religion, whither each land sent its thought to be made up into something useful, this man occupied a very remarkable position." You may get a very good idea of the state of things in Alexandria, at the commencement of the Christian Era, from a recently published historical novel, entitled Hypatia, written by an English Episcopal Minister. In that emporium of commerce and philosophy, Philo lived. "He had been a great studer of the sacred books of the Jews—and with the writings of Plato, whose philosophy was at that time in the highest repute at Alexandria, he made himself intimately acquainted, and completely adopted the Grecian philosophers doctrines, unless, perhaps, his opinions were modified somewhat by the oriental theories respecting the nature of God, which then enjoyed no little repute in Alexandria. Philo, either because he did not sufficiently understand the Jewish doctrines, or because he was not satisfied with the literal sense of the Mosaic law, mingled Platonic doctrines with the teachings of the Hebrew law-giver and prophets."

Probably it was in the mind of Philo, more than any where else, that the doctrine of the Trinity was first conceived; although it was not fully developed until several centuries afterwards. In the second century a number of Platonic philosophers became converts to the new faith, and were made Bishops of the Christian Church. The first of these whose opinions upon the subject in question can be ascertained, was Justin Martyr, who flourished A. D., 140. He taught that Christ was a God, though inferior to the Father; that he made all things, but that he did it at the will of the highest God. The following quotations from his writings will speak to this point more plainly than I can. In reference to the God of heaven, and that God who appeared on earth, he says (in his dialogues, page 418) "The former is the Lord of that Lord who was upon earth, being his *Father* and God, *the cause* of his existence, and of his being so powerful, and Lord and God." He had already said on the 252 page of the same volume, "I will endeavor to show, that he who appeared to Abraham, Jacob and Moses, and who is called God in

scripture, is different from the God who made all things—*numerically different, but the same in will.* For I say, that he never did anything but what that God, who made all things, and above whom there is no God, willed that he should do and say." See "James Forrest's account." For want of time, I pass over the writings of Irenæus (A. D. 178,) Clement of Alexandria (A. D. 194) and Tertullian (A. D. 200.) In each of them, although very high titles and exalted rank are ascribed to Christ, yet are there not only plain intimations, but plain declarations that they regarded him as God only in a subordinate sense. And I have room only for one quotation from Origen, who flourished in 230, and was perhaps the most distinguished theologian of his age. The principles of biblical interpretation which this Father taught, helped greatly to draw out from the Bible the doctrine, which calumniated in the mind of Athanasius, or of one who in the beginning of the 5th century, wrote in his name. Yet Origen says, "We maintain, that the Saviour and the Holy Spirit are as much or even more excelled by THE FATHER, than Christ and the Holy Spirit excel other things; and Christ though excelling such and such great things (as thrones, principalities and powers,) in essence and office, and power and godhead, is by no means to be compared with the FATHER." See *Forrest's Translation.*

Dr. Priestly in his history of Early Opinions, and in his history of the Corruptions of Christianity; Dr. Muencher, Professor of Theology at Marburg; and the Rev. Mr. Forrest of Edinburgh, (not to mention others) have shown (as clearly as the progress of any opinion can be shown) the growth and development of this doctrine of the Tri-une God, from certain ideas of the divine nature advanced by Plato, through the philosophy of Philo, and thence through a succession of Platonizing Fathers of the Church, until it was stated, in all necessary detail, in the Athanasian creed, at the beginning of the 5th century. The history that we have of the controversies that agitated the church through the 2d, 3d and 4th centuries, shows how strenuously this doctrine was opposed, in the successive stages of its growth, by the unlearned Christians, especially those who had once been Jews. The historian

Mosheim, acknowledges that it is an old complaint, "that the Fathers or teachers of the ancient church were too much inclined to the philosophy of Plato, and rashly confounded what was taught by that philosopher with the doctrines of Christ our Savior."

The very learned Cudworth, in his great work on "The Intellectual System," institutes a comparison between the forms, in which the doctrine of the Trinity was held by the heathen Platonists on the one hand, and by the Christian Fathers on the other. "Thus," says he, "have we given a true and full account, how, according to Athanasius, the three divine hypostases are really but one God or Divinity. In all which doctrine of his there is nothing but what a true and genuine Platonist would readily subscribe to." He further adds that the generality of the Christian Fathers before and after Nicene Council, represent the genuine Platonic Trinity as really the same thing with the Christian, or as approaching so near to it, that they differed chiefly in circumstances, or the manner of expression." And he moreover tells us that Athanasius, in his debates with his Arian opposers would bid them go to school to the Platonists."

There has been no more distinguished defender of the doctrine of the Trinity, than Dr. Horsey in his controversy with Dr. Priestley. In his 18th letter, I find the following passage: "I am very sensible that the Platonizers of the 2d century were the orthodox of that age. I have not denied this, on the contrary, I have endeavored to show that their Platonism brings no imputation upon their orthodoxy." And again he says: "It must be acknowledged that the first converts to Christianity, from the Platonic school took advantage of the resemblance between the evangelic and Platonic doctrine on the subject of the Godhead, to apply the principles of their old philosophy to the explication and confirmation of the articles of their faith. They defended it by arguments drawn from Platonic principles, and even pronounced it in Platonic language."

Even Neander, the author of the "History of the Christian Religion and Church, during the first three centuries," which I believe is in high favor with our orthodox brethren; even Neander implies, that what are now usually

considered the doctrines of the church, were not developed until controversies arose; and then when the brains of men were stimulated by the heat of controversy between the old opinions that had come to them from their former religions, and the new opinions which they had embraced on coming into the Christian church, in the heat of controversy these doctrines were thought out and introduced into the creeds of Christendom. This or something very like this his translator appends, "is the impression which would generally be entertained by most of his readers." See the translator's preface to the 2d volume.

When Peter (Matt. xvi. 10) said to Jesus, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God," —our Savior replied, "as surely as thou art Peter" (which means a rock) "upon this rock" this fundamental truth which thou hast declared, "upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This was the primitive doctrine of the gospel; no other doctrine than this was preached by the apostles, so far as we can learn from the Book of Acts. The Ethiopian Eunuch was baptized by Peter on declaring faith in this doctrine.

For the first two or three centuries, the "Apostle's Creed" was the creed of the church. In it there is not a syllable about the deity of Christ—or a Trinity in the Godhead.

The Nicene Creed, in which this doctrine is almost but not quite declared, was introduced into the church in the year 325. And the Athanasian Creed about a hundred years afterwards, or near the beginning of the 5th century. These creeds alone are sufficient to show what the doctrine of the Gospel of Jesus Christ was, and what the doctrine of the church became under the influence of the Platonizing Fathers.

TENTH EVENING MARCH 21.

MR. LEE'S FIRST SPEECH.

There were a few things said on the last evening of our discussion to which I wish to call attention.

I. Mr. May's defense of his conduct in circulating a certain book is peculiar.

1. His excuse is that though it contains some errors, yet it contains more important truth.

But that book contains three fundamental errors, according to his avowed theory.

(1.) It contains the doctrine of hereditary depravity, page 19, 41, 43.

(2.) It contains the doctrine of the miraculous conception, with an endorsement of those portions of the record which Mr. May pronounces a forgery.

(3.) It contains the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, and asserts that doctrine as the only ground of the saving power of Christianity.

These are all fundamental.

2. Another excuse which he rendered for circulating such a book, was that the Bible itself contained errors.

If the Bible contains such fundamental errors, it ought not to be circulated.

Why does he not get out an edition of the Bible free from those parts which he pronounces forgeries?

But he referred you to the headings of the Chapters.

They are no part of the Bible.

Mr. May is the only person I ever heard appeal to them as proof of any thing.

But this charge that the Bible contains errors, is a fearful matter, for until he tells where the errors lie, which is true and which is false, the whole stands impeached.

II. The historical argument demands a brief notice.

1. His attack upon the credibility of the history of those early times avails him nothing.

He begun the argument from history.

He has no other authorities to rely upon but those I have quoted.

These are the only authority, and of course cannot be disproved except by their own contents.

2. He has failed to quote one passage which contradicts any thing I have said, or the doctrine I advocate. But my quotations are absolutely inconsistent with his views.

He first quoted Eusebius as authority. I then quoted him in which he affirms the miraculous conception, the divinity of Christ, and the union of God and man in Jesus Christ.

Eusebius was born A. D. 267, and died 339 or 340. His history commences with the birth of Christ, and closes with the final victory Constantine, which occurred 324. His is the

only entire history we have of that period, by any early writer.

My friend asserted that the denial of the divinity of Christ was not maintained to be a heresy until the time of Epiphanius, (about 350.)

This I will now prove to be an entire mistake.

Eusebius says, Book IV. Chap. xxvi. "Melito wrote a "treatise on the Incarnate God." He wrote about the middle of the second century.

Again, Eusebius says, Book V. Chap. xviii. Page 213, 214.

"In a work written by a certain one of these authors against the heresy of Artemon, which Paul of Samosata again attempted to revive among us, there is a narrative well adapted to the history we are now investigating. This writer, not long since, in refuting the heresy mentioned, which asserts that Christ is a mere man, since its leaders wish to boast as if it were the ancient doctrine, besides many other arguments that he adduces in refutation of their impious falsehood, he gives the following account : 'For they assert,' says he, 'that all those primitive men and the apostles themselves, both received and taught these things as they are now taught by them, and that the truth of the gospel was preserved until the times of Victor, who was the thirteenth bishop of Rome and Peter. But that from his successor Zephyrinus, the truth was mutilated. And perchance what they say might be credible, were it not that the holy Scriptures contradict them ; and then, also, there are works of certain brethren older than Victor's times, which they wrote in defense of the truth, and against the heresies then prevailing. I speak of Justus and Miltiades, and Tatian and Clement, and many others, in all which the divinity of Christ is asserted. For who knows not the works of Ireneus and Melito, and the rest, in which Christ is announced as God and man ? Whatever psalms and hymns were written by the brethren from the beginning, celebrate Christ the word of God, by asserting his divinity. How then could it happen, that since the doctrine of the church has been proclaimed for so many years, that those until the times of Victor, preached the gospel, after this manner ? And how are they so devoid of shame to utter these falsehoods against Victor, well knowing that Victor excommunicated that currier Theodosius, the leader and father of this God-denying apostacy, as the first one that asserted Christ was a mere man. For had Victor entertained the sentiments which their impious doctrine promulgates, how could he have expelled Theodosius, the inventor of this heresy ?'

The precise date of Artemon I cannot state. Paul, of Samosata, is declared to have been deposed A. D. 269, Mosheim's Commentary.

Victor was bishop of Rome about A.D. 194.

He deposes Theodosius who is declared to have been the inventor of the heresy 126 years before Epiphanius.

But did not the Ebionites exist before this date ? They did, but they separated from the body of Christians and refused to hold fellowship with them, because they did not keep the Law of Moses. They were not regarded as Christians, were but a very small fraction, and soon ceased to exist.

Mosheim's Commentary, Vol. I. Page 220.

A beautiful allusion to this fact is found in the book Mr. May has so industriously circulated among his people.

"And it is quite as remarkable, that no sect or body of men that has received Christianity only as an abstract system of faith and morals, and its Founder only as an historical person, leaving out the living Christ as the ever-present medium of the Divine energy, has ever worn for itself a place in history, as one of the great motive forces of human progress. Such sects have only a feeble and transitory existence."

I will now close the historical argument by remarking :

1. The denial of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ is referred to in early history only as a heresy. It is never spoken of by any early writer as the doctrine of the Church.

2. It is not and never was the doctrine of the Church in any age.

3. Those who have advocated it have always been and still are a mere fraction. At this hour Unitarians in this country are a fraction of less than one to thirty.

III. His exposition of the temptation of Christ, demands a brief notice.

He maintains that the Saviour was not tempted of the Devil.

The gospel says he was,

He was tempted, for Paul affirms he "was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin."—Heb. iv. 15.

But Mr. May says the temptation arose from the suggestions of his own mind.

Then he had the devil within him.

But the text will admit of no such explanation.

If there is any such being as a devil, he must

have been concerned in the temptation of Christ, the account is so plain, direct and positive. Matthew says he was tempted of the Devil, Mark says he was tempted of Satan, and Luke says it was the Devil.

Mr. May quoted as an explanation—

“ Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed.”—James i. 14. Was Christ tempted by being drawn away by his own lusts?

This certainly is less to his credit than to suppose the devil tempted him.

But my theory is, that it was necessary that he should be tempted by the devil, and overcome, to make the captain of our salvation perfect, and for this I have high authority.

“ Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto *his* brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted.”—Heb. ii. 17, 18.

I will at this point leave my friend to fight his battle with the words of inspiration.

I will now occupy the few moments remaining, with some remarks on the doctrine of the atonement. The occasion for special attention to this theme grows out of the fact that the doctrine of the Atonement is generally denied by Unitarians. For, denying the Divinity of Christ, they see that there can be no such thing as an atonement for sin by a mere man; and they are driven by a logical necessity to deny that there is any such Atonement for sin.

I shall first present and comment upon a few texts which will give us a correct idea of the atonement.

“ Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; To declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.”

“Redemption”—Greek, *apolutrosis*, from *apolo*, to dismiss. “ Ransom, release, deliverance from captivity, redemption from the thrall-dom of sin.—Groves Greek and Eng. Dic.

“ A deliverance procured by the payment of a ransom.”—Greenfield.

“ Propitiation”—Greek, *hilasteerion*. “ Propitiation, atonement, expiation.”—Grove.

“ One who makes expiation, a propitiator, or propitiatory sacrifice.”—Greenfield.

The facts are set forth in the text, that

1. We have redemption by Christ who is our propitiation, that is, the expiatory sacrifice by which God is rendered propitious.

2. By virtue of this, God can be just, and the justifier of such as believe in Jesus.

To justify, is to pardon our sins, as it was for the remission of sins that are past, that Christ became our propitiation.

3. It is implied that without this offering on the part of Christ, God could not be just and justify sinners.

“ And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.”—1 John 1, 2.

MR. MAY'S FIRST SPEECH.

As we have agreed to close this discussion in one evening after this, there will be scarcely time enough for me to say what I ought on several topics that I have not yet touched upon. I must therefore wholly omit much more that I intended to say on subjects already considered. Nor can I spend any time in answering several things that have just now fallen from my opponent.

Mr. Lee will have it, and he has taken no little pains to make you believe that I pay no respect to the Bible; that I reject its authority, and fling away whatever I meet with on its pages, that I dislike. It is useless to repeat what I have said. If at no very distant day my friend will furnish the opponent he has promised me, I will endeavor to show him and our audiences, what was the origin, what the true use of our sacred scriptures. He abuses them as much, who makes them responsible for false doctrines that they were never intended to teach; as he does, who rejects what they may declare to be true.

Mr. Lee has this evening brought up again Matt. iv. 1. He first quoted it to prove that the Holy Spirit must be a person for he was

here said to have performed the personal act of leading Jesus up into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. I replied that was not an act which the Holy Spirit would or could do. It would be to make himself as bad as the tempter. A very common latin adage is "*facit per alium facit per se.*"

Now, sir, I say again once for all, this passage is a most unfortunate one for Mr. Lee's proposition every way. If the spirit here spoken of really led Jesus up to be tempted of the devil, he could not have been God, "for God tempteth no man." And if Jesus was really tempted, of which there can be no doubt, then he was not God, "for God cannot be tempted of evil." There I leave all I have to say on this text, in a nut shell.

There is not time for me here, to explain to my brother what I suppose the temptation of our Savior to have been. If there are any here who desire to understand my views of that matter, I now give notice that next Sunday evening I will repeat from my own pulpit, a discourse on the temptation of Jesus, that I preached to my church some time ago.

I know not how to account for the course Mr. Lee took in his argument the other evening, upon the Trinity' unless he found, as I forewarned him he would find it, harder even to prove that three Gods are one God, or that three persons of infinite power, and perfect wisdom are but one person, than to prove that there are three such beings. There is some evidence of the existence of more Gods than one; and the majority of mankind, in all ages, have believed in a plurality of deities. But the amazing proposition, which my friend has undertaken to maintain, is, that three such beings are but one being. I have never denied, here or elsewhere, that there is a Father, a Son, and a Holy Spirit. Nor have I denied that, in a certain sense, they are one. They are one in purpose. They co-operate in the redemption of man, which is the subject matter of the gospel. But my friend undertook to prove that they are one in substance, power and eternity; and that altogether they constitute but one God. For six or seven evenings all his direct arguments were intended to prove first, that Jesus Christ bore all the titles,

and possessed all the attributes, performed all the works, and received all the worship ascribed to the Father; so that as I remarked, if the Father should cease to be, he would not be missed; secondly, that the Holy Ghost bore all the titles, possessed of all the attributes and performed all the work ascribed to the Father and the Son; so that if they should both cease to be, they would not be missed. Well, sir, if those arguments had established what they were intended to prove (which I all along denied) then it remained for him, in order to maintain his proposition, to make it appear beynd a question, that the three persons named Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—each of them possessing almighty power, and perfect wisdom, are not three persons, but one person, are not three Gods, but one God. This is manifestly an essential part of his doctrine. But what, sir, did he do when he came to it? Why he attempted by a sort of logical legerdemain, to put it wholly out of sight, and put something else in its stead. I beg you to look attentively that you may see how adroitly it was done, or rather I should say, seemed to be done.

He said, 1st, that he and Mr. May were agreed that there is but one God; 2d, said he it has been proved that the Son or Word is God; and 3d, he asserted, it has been proved that the Holy Ghost is God; therefore, he coolly added, it follows that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost exist in the unity of the Godhead, because we have agreed that there is but one God; and then went on quoting texts, which if they proved anything, to his purpose, proved that there were three persons, sustaining some relation to each other—but by no means, that the three are one—that they exist in the same Godhead; which was the very thing incumbent upon him to prove.

I by no means say that my friend was conscious of any logical trick or unfairness in all this—or that he committed the mistake so fatal to his argument, called by logicians "*petitio principii*"—or begging the question. Men who have trained their intellects to believe, that three are one, and one is three, may make such a mistake as this unconsciously. But I must call Mr. Lee back to perform the hardest part of the task he has undertaken, or else

acknowledge he cannot do it. He stated that point very clearly, in the opening of his argument on the Trinity, but lost sight of it immediately. Let me then give him back his own words, that he may see in them the impossibility of proving what he undertook in this discussion to maintain.

True, as he says—"he and I are agreed that there is but one God, and that *the person called the Father* is God in the *fullest and highest sense*." Mark this, sir, as declared by Mr. Lee himself, he has agreed with me and I with him, that "there is but one God, and that the person called *the Father*, is God in the *fullest and highest sense*. Now sir, this presents plainly to my opponent the very point he should have met, and which he must not evade. If, as he allows, "The Father is God in the fullest and highest sense," then certainly, I insist, if there be any meaning in words—any sense in comparisons, no other persons can be Gods excepting in a lower sense; and I have admitted all along, with St. Paul, that in a lower sense there may be Gods many and Lords many; but in the highest sense, on y one God, **THE FATHER**.

It cannot justly be required of me, sir, to spend any of the precious time, that remains to me in this discussion, in examining the texts, which Mr. Lee brought forward to sustain the position he saw fit to take under this head; for if he will look at it again, he will see that his position was aside from the line of argument he was bound to pursue—and therefore, all his labor, under that head, was spent for naught.

If his argument, from the plural form of the Hebrew word in Gen. i 26, translated God, proves anything to his purpose, (which the best trinitarian hebrew scholars deny) it proves that there were several Gods engaged in the creation of man; not that there are several persons in the one person, whom we call God.

And again, if it be true, that there be in the Godhead such a three-fold personality, (or rather I should say such a composition of three Gods as to make only one) then must there be in man the same complication of persons; for in the next verse we are told that, what in the 26th verse the Elohim proposed to do, they actually did, i. e. created man in their own

image. My opponent's friend and helper, Mr. Sears, agrees with me perfectly on this point. He says in the book Mr. Lee read from the other evening, page 68, "If there be a trinity in God, there would also be a trinity in man; that likeness which a pencil of rays out of his own nature has made of itself and projected into time. And just so far as it fails of realization in the likeness and the copy, will the words that describe it be *words*, and nothing more." Mr. Sears had said just before, "Man is created in the image of God, and so in man the creator has abridged and copied out his own attributes. Were it not so, we could have no communion with the Eternal Father, any more than the beasts of the field or the clods of the valley."

The other texts which Mr. Lee quoted, Isa. vi. 1, 2, 3, 8, xxxiv. 16, xlvi. 16, 17, 18, and Haggai ii. 4, 5, 6, 7, do not assert, imply, or in any way help to prove that the three beings, or persons spoken of in them are one being or person, which is the only thing Mr. Lee had got to prove. They all lead to the opposite belief.

Mr. Lee next summons us again to the baptismal scene, Matt. iii. 16. Here he says, "we have a clear view of the three persons in the Godhead—the Son coming up from the water, the Holy Ghost alighting upon him, and the Father speaking from heaven." I grant we have a very clear view of three persons in this scene, (if the spirit may for the moment be considered a person;) so clearly indeed do we discover three here, that it is all the more difficult, after this presentation of them, to conceive how they can be numerically or literally one, or one in any other sense, than in the interest they unitedly took, in the redemption of the world, for which Jesus was just then anointed. Certainly there is not a syllable in the whole account, that declares or intimates any such unity as my brother contends for.

He next calls our attention to Matt. xxviii, 19, a passage that Mr. Lee has several times brought forward in this discussion. I might here also content myself with saying, that the text is good for proving that there is a Father, a Son, and a Holy Spirit, which I never denied; but it says not a syllable about the three being one God. It does not intimate that they are

persons co-existent in the Godhead. My friends comments upon the prssage more than intimate, they declare that such is the tri-unity of God. But his words are no part of the sacred text. I will therefore respectfully lay them aside, and give you mine in their stead.

Let me ask you to observe, that is in the the very verse before, that Jesus said, "all power is *given me* in heaven and in earth."

He was not then the original source of power. Another higher and mightier than himself had bestowed upon him, all that he possessed. God gives to all, but receives nothing from any except acknowledgments of the gifts he has bestowed. As Jesus *received* his power, he must have been indebted to the giver for it, and accountable for its use. By the holy ghost, as here used, must have been meant the divine power manifested in his apostles, as well as in Christ himself, by which influence and aid the Gospel then was to be, and since has been, propagated and supportd. "Go ye therefore" I understand the meaning of our Lord's injunction to be—"Go ye therefore and teach all nations" the Gospel I have lived to declare, and have died—and risen again to confirm; "baptizing them in the name of the Father," from whom cometh every good and perfect gift; "and of the son" through whom this best gift has been bestowed upon mankind, "and of the holy spirit" by which its influence is felt, and shall be more and more disseminated amongst men.

For want of time, I pass over his quotation from Jude 20. 21. the true meaning of which will be at once seen by those who may accept the exposition of the text I have just given; and of the one I am now to give. This is the last that Mr. Lee quoted the other evening.

2 Cor. XIII. 14. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the holy spirit be with you all."—How often have I pronounced this benediction upon the church, to which I minister, without thought of the strange, incomprehensible doctrine, which my friend has invoked it to prove. In stead of that inexplicable mystery, which for ages has perplexed the minds of men, and convulsed the church,—when I pronounce these beautiful words, I express the hope that those, who have been my hearers, may enjoy

the favor of Jesus Christ, the benefit of the instructions of that great Teacher of God and godliness. I express the hope, that they may know the Father, whom to know is life eternal; and be loved by the Father as his dear children; and I express the hope, that the holy spirit that cometh from God, may so quicken the spirit in them, that they may be brought into communion, unity, at-one-ment with the dear Father in heaven, and his dearly beloved son, their elder brother.

Here I have gived you a plain intimation of that unity which subsists between God and Christ—that unity, into which, Christ lived and died to persuade us all to enter. This is the trinity I believe in; God, Christ, and the Spirit that is in man. A trinity that would become a unity all the sooner, if the churches would uphold, and the ministers would teach religion, rather than their theologies—Religion! that deep sense of dependence upon, and accountability to the Father, which alone can support and cheer us amid the trials and temptation of life; and arouse and impel us to the strictest fidelity to God—the true, the right, and the good under all circumstances, in all relations: Religion! that strong faith in God as the Father, the impartial Father of all, that shall bring us to regard and respect the rights of all men as his children, and our brethren. This is the religion which Jesus taught—the religion that is to redeem and bless the world; the religion alas! which has so often been set aside in the churches to give place to the doctrines and commandments of men.

Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence says, in one of his letters to the venerable John Adams—"Had the doctrines of Jesus been preached always as they came from his lips, the whole civilized world would now have been christian. I rejoice that in this blessed country of free inquiry and belief, which has surrendered its creed and conscience to neither kings nor priests, the genuine doctrine of one only God is reviving." p. 365.

Again he says in a letter to James Smith—"In fact, the Athanasian paradox, that one is three, and three but one, is so incomprehensible to the human mind, that no candid man can say he has any idea of it; and how can he be-

lieve what presents no idea? He, who thinks he does, only deceives himself."—Letters, page 360.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to mention as a very pertinent fact, in confirmation of this last remark of President Jefferson's, that the three mightiest minds of England in the 17th Century, after profound and long continued study of the Bible, renounced this dogma of the Trinity, as unscriptural no less than irrational—I allude Sir—to Milton, Locke, and Newton—one, the greatest poet; the second, the greatest metaphysician; the third, the greatest mathematician of his age—and each of them as great in his own department as any that ever lived.

Sir, I wish my friend, here, would tell me before we close this discussion, whether he really believes this doctrine of the Trinity, in any intelligible sense; in any sense capable of being illustrated by any thing in the universe of matter or of mind. For, Sir, if there be nothing in us, or without us, perceptible to us, or conceivable by us, in which he can image to his mind and to mine this doctrine of the triune God, then must faith in it be in his case, as it doubtless is, in the cases of thousands more, the mere assent of the mind to an unintelligible and profitless proposition, an assent, demanded by the authority of the churches, and feebly supported perhaps by a kind of evidence wrung from the Bible, by the peculiar method of examining that witness, which the advocates of this Incomprehensibility have seen fit to adopt.

Let not my brother tell me again, that this doctrine pertains to the nature of God, which our finite minds cannot fathom, cannot comprehend, cannot find out to perfection. I grant all that of course. But I say in reply—why then do you come to me with a proposition, which you insist does declare the mode of God's existence? You do not give me this statement in the words of Jesus, or of his apostles, or of Moses or the prophets. You have no higher authority for this doctrine than Saint Athanasies, or some other platonizing father who lived in the 4th or 5th Century of the Christian Era. If you can show me that God has by any of his messengers, announced this doctrine to the world, as a sublime mystery, not to be under-

stood, but yet to be adored as a truth, I shall submit—but when Mr. Lee or the writers of the 39 Articles of the Episcopal Church, or of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, come to me with this dogma, couched in language more or less offensive, and demand that I shall believe it, or be regarded by them as an infidel, I certainly may say what do you mean by it? What intelligible idea do you give me of the signification of your own words? If they cannot explain their own proposition; then I shall tell them "they themselves know not whereof they affirm" and certainly I cannot expound the meaning of such a proposition for them; and so must wait until they have found out what it means, before I can tell them whether I believe it or no—whether the Bible teaches it or no. As it now appears it is utterly inconsistent, self contradictory and absurd. Three infinite, eternal persons in one—three Gods in one! what can be more impossible? What more self contradictory?

But my brother has come here, with the Bible, and claims that he has proved from its testimony, 1st, that Jesus of Nazareth was a man, having a human nature, with "all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof" which no body will deny—and 2d, that that same being or person was and is the, almighty, unchangeable, perfect God. Well, I promptly reply, that is as plain a contradiction as you can propose to my understanding. Ah! he rejoins it is taught in the Bible, and so you ought to believe it. "I grant" says Mr. Lee, "that all the facts of his history show that he was a man—but the words of the Bible teach me that he was also God: so I believe he was both in one." Before I yield to this kind of reasoning let me test it, in application to one or two other cases. The Bible teaches, all its language on the subject would lead us to believe, that the earth is a vast immovable, or stationary body, and that the sun, moon and stars rise in the east and roll over it to the west.—Such is the daily and nightly declaration to our senses, and such was evidently the belief of the prophets, and the Savior and his apostles—and such is the meaning of what they said in reference to this matter. But the science of astronomers, since the Bible was written, has proved beyond a question, that the Sun is the center

of a system of worlds to which the earth belongs, and that the earth not only turns upon its axis but revolves around the sun. Now, friend Lee undoubtedly believes this as much as I do. But what will he do with the scripture testimony on this point? The same deference he shows to the letter of the Bible in the other case, should lead him to believe both, viz: that the sun revolves around the earth, and the earth around the sun at the same time.—But this is an impossibility, and so he cannot believe both. He must reject one doctrine or the other. If he decides, as he must decide in favor of the doctrine of Copernicus; then shall I tell him that the doctrine of two natures in Christ is more inconsistent and self contradictory, than would be the doctrine that the sun turns round the earth and the earth round the sun at the same time. And that the addition of a third person to his Godhead only increases the difficulty, as much as it would in the other case to introduce another planet to revolve around the earth at the same time that they are each revolving around it, and around each other.

MR. LEE'S SECOND SPEECH.

I shall devote my remarks mainly to an examination of Mr. May's reply to my arguments. He says that Unitarians believe in hereditary depravity. Now, as he believes in a human Saviour, his Saviour is a depraved man.

Mr. May—That does not follow.

Mr. Lee—Then you don't believe in hereditary depravity.

Mr. May—No! no! You dont understand Unitarianism.

Mr. Lee—Ah! That may be!

He also says that Unitarians believe in the divinity of Christ, but not in his deity, in reference to a quotation I made from Mr. Sears' book. Now I will read that again:

"St. John asserts the same truth in describing the Divine Word made flesh, that is, brought down into the conditions of mortal existence and clothed in human form. He is asserting the ground of Christ's plenary authority and wisdom, and this he does by describing these fleshly surroundings as enfolding the Divine wisdom, life within life,—the infinite become visible in the finite, not by being super-induced upon Christ by special gift, but by forming the inmost principle of his natural being. Nothing less than this satisfies the record of the supernatural conception by Matthew, or of the Divine incarnation by John."

We do not stop at what is mortal and finite in the fact of the Divine incarnation; we do not even see the finite, but look through it as we look through glass to see the sun; and then the Divine nature unveils itself to our longing vision, and out of Jesus Christ comes the unclouded blaze of the Godhead!"

In respect to the temptation of Christ, Mr. May has said that I introduced it. But this is a mistake. I only quoted the text that speaks of Christ being led up of the spirit to be tempted of the Devil, to show that the acts attributed to the Holy Sprit were such as a person only can perform. Mr. May denied that the Spirit did any such thing. That brought up the issue. Now the war is between him and the Scriptures. They declare that Christ was led up of the Spirit to be tempted of the Devil. Mr. May says it was not so—that his temptation was by his own evil thoughts. The evangelist says, moreover, that he was full of the Holy Ghost. Now, if he was full of the Holy Ghost, how could he be possessed to any extent with evil, or so as to be tempted by it? The sum of the matter is, that Mr. May has arrayed himself against the Scriptures. And he has no hesitancy in arraying himself against the record, when it does not suit his purpose. And indeed, he is ready to discuss that question, as he tells you himself.

I now resume the remarks I was offering on the Redemption of man by the propitiation through Christ.

Propitiation—the Greek word is *hilasmos*, from *hilao*—to propitiate: "A propitiation, atonement, reconciliation, a sacrifice, sin-offering."—*Grove*.

"Propitiation: expiation, one who makes expiation, propitiatory sacrifice."—*Greenfield*.

In 1 John i. 2, he is presented, not only as our propitiation, but also as our advocate with the Father. Christ is our intercessor at the throne of God, by whom and through whom alone we can obtain access to God.

"But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." Heb. vii. 24, 25.

Intercession—Greek—*Entunkano*, to apply to, entreat, mediate.

The doctrine is, that Christ offered himself for sinners, an expiatory sacrifice, by virtue of which, and by which only, they can be pardoned and made holy and happy forever.

The above texts have been quoted for the purpose of obtaining a statement of the doctrine. The principal proof is yet to come.

I. The necessity of such an expiatory sacrifice as Christ has offered, may be demonstrated by reason and common sense, after an admission of the existence of God as a moral governor of our race, as set forth in the Scriptures.

1. All men are required by the law of God to obey him perfectly.

2. The penalty of God's law being death, is endless in its own nature.

"The soul that sinneth it shall die." Eze. xviii. 20.

"The wages of sin is death." Rom. vi. 23.

"To be carnally minded is death." Rom. viii. 6.

"Sin, when finished, bringeth forth death." James, i. 15.

"Even when we were dead in sin hath he quickened us together with Christ." Ephesians ii. 5.

Death, whether natural or moral, physical or spiritual, is in its own nature endless.

Death is the negation of life, the absence of that life to which it stands opposed.

Where there is death there is no life; and where there is no life, life can never be, unless it be communicated by some foreign agent.

For God to interpose his power and quicken the dead sinner, is to remit the penalty of his law, which is death. We have now reached this point; no sinner can be saved but by a pardon. How, then, is this pardon to be obtained?

1. It cannot be obtained on legal ground. The law makes no provision for the remission of its own penalty. This is settled by good authority.

"Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Gal. iii. 21.

This text asserts that the law could not give life; it did not provide for the remission of its own penalty.

A law providing for the remission of its penalty, would be, in effect, the same as a law with no penalty, which would be of no force.

2. A pardon cannot be looked for by the mere prerogative of God.

All the perfections of God prove this point.*

(1.) Immutability forbids it.

God having annexed the sanction of death to his law, must change to annul it, without a reason like the atonement.

(2.) Justice, in such case, would be violated either in the annunciation of the death penalty, or in its remission without a new reason.

(3.) The same wisdom which determined upon the penalty of death, cannot avert it without the atonement.

(4.) The same goodness which consented to the law with death as its sanction, cannot demand the sinners pardon without satisfaction.

3. The only remaining ground of pardon is the true one, satisfaction to public justice.

We have now secured two points, viz: first no sinner can be saved but by a pardon; and secondly, no pardon can be granted but on the ground of satisfaction, or an atonement.

We now come to the third link in the chain of argument, which is, man cannot make satisfaction or atone for his own sin.

Man has nothing to offer as an atonement for his sin on which the law has not already fixed its claim.

Future obedience, were it rendered, would not atone for past sins.

The law requires obedience during the whole of our existence, but such an one could obey only during a part of his existence.

If then, no human being can atone for his own sin, much less for the sins of others, the offering made by Christ is the only ground of hope for humanity.

II. The types and symbols of the Mosaic Ritual, as a significant index, all point to the death of Christ, as the sinners real and only atoning sacrifice, and expiation.

I have not time to read all the ceremonial law, nor to spread before you the sacrificial worship of fifteen hundred years.

I will refer you to the common sin-offering.

"And if any one of the common people sin through ignorance, which he doeth *somewhat against* any of the commandments of the Lord, concerning things which ought not to be done, and be guilty; or if his sin, which he hath sinned, come to his knowledge; then he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a female without blemish, for his sins which he hath sinned. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering, and slay the sin-offering in the place of the burnt-offering. And the priest shall take of the blood thereof with his

finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and shall pour out all the blood thereof at the bottom of the altar. And he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat is taken away from off the sacrifice of peace-offerings ; and the priest shall burn it upon the altar, for a sweet savour unto the Lord : and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him." Lev. 4 : 27-31.

I will also refer you to the annual atonement. " And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel two kids of the goats for a sin-offering, and one ram for a burnt-offering. And he shall take the two goats, and present them before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats ; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scape-goat. And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the Lord's lot fell, and offer him for a sin-offering : But the goat, on which the lot fell to be the scape-goat, shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement with him, and to let him go for a scape-goat into the wilderness. And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness. And the goat shall bear upon him, all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited : and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness." Lev. 16 : 5-22.

These offerings all foretold the death of Christ as an offering for sinners, not as an example of patient suffering merely, but as an expiation for the sins of men.

III. The Scriptures teach directly in various ways and forms of speech that Christ did die as an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of man.

" But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities : the chastisement of our peace was upon him ; and with his stripes we are healed. All we, like sheep, have gone astray ; we have turned every one to his own way ; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Isa. 53 : 5, 6.

" Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness ; by whose stripes ye were healed." 1 Pet. 2 : 24.

" Even as the Son of man came not to be min-

istered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Matt. 20 : 28.

The word here rendered ransom is *Lutron*. It is derived from *luo*, to pay, hence, ransom means a price paid for the redemption of a captive.

" Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." 1 Tim. 2 : 6.

Here the word rendered ransom is *antilutron*, from *anti* against, and *lutron*, a price denoting that Christ laid down his life against or opposite our lives, as a price in exchange.

" But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." Rom. 5 : 8, 9.

" But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his son, made of a woman, made under the law. To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Gal. 4 : 4, 5.

" In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Epp. 1 : 7.

" Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Titus 2 : 14.

" But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." 1 John 1 : 7.

" And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first-begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father ; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." Rev. 1 : 5, 6.

The above Scriptures can never be explained upon any principle which denies that the death of Christ was an expiation for the sinner's guilt. It is on no other principle that his suffering can be accounted for. He clearly suffered more than any other human being ever did, or ever will suffer. He suffered before any violence was offered to his person. How will you account for that dreadful agony in the garden, during which he sweat great drops of blood ? There appeared an angel strengthening him, that he might bear the agony, and how much he suffered with those celestial props beneath

him we can never know. It is probable to me that he suffered enough to have crushed every member of the human family out of existence. And what caused all this suffering? The answer is, the weight of the world's sin was upon him, he bore our sins in his own body on the tree. On the cross, when that terrible agony returned, he cried out, "my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" All this can be accounted for only on the ground that he suffered for the sins of the world. If he died merely as an example of patient suffering, we find brighter examples in Paul, Peter, Polycarp, and a hundred of other martyrs, who died joyfully and shouted amid the consuming fires,—no such dread of the scene as Jesus manifested, and no such complaint as he uttered. If they all died as mere martyrs, the Apostles appear to the best advantage; but if we admit that Christ died for the sins of men, all is plain. This is the doctrine of the Scriptures I have quoted, and it is this glorious doctrine that supported the martyrs; they believed it in life, trusted it in death, and sing its triumph in heaven. Worthy is the Law for he was slain, and hath redeemed us to God, and hath washed us in his own blood.

On Thursday evening next this discussion will be closed. In my first speech I shall reply to what Mr. May has said this evening, on the subject of the Trinity and the atonement, and in my second speech, I shall sum up the whole discussion, and conclude it on my part.

MR. MAY'S 2D SPEECH ON 10TH EVENING.

I will state the subject of the remarks Mr. Lee has just been making, as he announced it in his second speech on the Fourth Evening of our debate. The sixth and last ground, he then said, on which he should maintain the deity of Christ was that

"Christianity as a saving system, proceeds upon the assumption, that Christ possesses supreme divinity, power and authority. The Gospel proceeds to offer eternal life to sinners, upon the assumption that Christ suffered and died as the sinner's substitute; to make satisfaction for sin; to be the sinner's propitiation, so that sinners may receive pardon through faith in him; and receive the gift of eternal life; which they could not have had without such death."

I really wish Mr. Lee had pointed me to at

least one place, where Jesus Christ made such an assumption as this, in plain language. I have never seen that place although I have been a reader of the New Testament for fifty years. Surely such a doctrine as my brother has announced to be the only ground of the sinner's hope, would have been wholly new to the Jews, to whom the Gospel was first sent, and therefore should have been explicitly stated by him, who was sanctified and sent into the world to save it. If there were really no efficacy in genuine repentance—there was the greatest need that the astounding fact should have been made known by Christ; because all the teaching of Moses and the prophets had gone to assure men that, "when the wicked man turneth from his wickedness and doeth that which is right, he shall save his soul."

The writings of Moses plainly teach the mercifulness of God, Exod. XXXIV. 6. 7. They represent him as, symbolically, dwelling on the mercy seat, and as showing mercy unto thousands of generations, Ex. XX. 6. They teach that he can rescind his threatenings, without any violation of the rectitude of his character, or infraction of the established rules of his government, or departure from the principles of his holy law; for they state that he did it in several instances in his dealings with his people. Moses assured the people of Israel that God would accept and bless them wholly on the ground of their obedience, Exod. XIX. 5. 6. He further assured them that if, after they had sinned, they repented, returned to the Lord, and became obedient to his voice, he would have compassion on them, and restore them to his favor; "for (saith he) the Lord thy God is a merciful God."

David and the other the writers of the Psalms describe God as forgiving sins, because of his merciful kindness. They teach that nothing but penitence is necessary, on the part of the sinner, in order to his being pardoned, and that moral excellence is the only condition on which divine pardon could be enjoyed.—Ps. XXXII. 1. Clll. 3–8. 2 Sam. XXII. 25, 26, 27. Psalms XV. and XXIV. and CXII. and LL. 16. 17.

Solomon, at the dedication of the Temple, in the prayer, which he offered in the hearing of the whole congregation of Israel, 2 Chron. VI chap. mentions no condition of pardon *but penitence*

and prayer. He says that God will render to every man according to his ways. In his Proverbs Ch. XIV. 14. he declares that “the good man shall be satisfied from himself.”

The prophet Isaiah most emphatically declares the sufficiency of repentance, for the acceptance of sinners with God, without any consideration but the divine mercy. See his first chapter, especially from the 16 to the 20 verse. He represents God as showing mercy and pardoning sin, simply on the ground of the sinner's forsaking his evil ways and returning to him, Ch. LV. 7. and his dwelling with the humble and contrite “to revive the spirit of the humble, and the heart of the contrite one,”—chap. LVII. 15. LXVI. 2. Throughout his prophecies, Isaiah represents God as acting towards nations and individuals according to their moral state. This prophet having so clearly and forcibly expressed himself on this wise in the plainest language—a few figurative expressions, that occur in his writings, ought not to be construed as teaching an opposite doctrine.

Jeremiah spent his days in lamentations over the sins of his people, and in calling them to repentance. He always declares that God will pardon and accept the penitent. “Only acknowledge thine iniquity” he says in the name of the Lord “Return ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings.” I have time only to refer you to Ch. III. 18–22. IV. 14. VII. 5–7.

In Ezekiel XVIII. there is as full and strong a declaration of the sufficiency of repentance to secure pardon and salvation to the sinner, as the words of any language could express.—I beg my friend Lee, and all who hear me to turn to that chapter, and read it all, but especially from the 21 to the 27 where they will find those comforting words, “when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness, that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive.”

Sir, if there were time, I could take you through Daniel and all the minor Prophets and quote from every one of them passage after passage, bearing witness to the mercifulness of God. Of the efficacy of repentance, as the condition of pardon, they seem not to have entertained a doubt. Very few passages can be

found in the Old Testament, which, seen even through the mist of orthodox theology, look as of the same complexion with the dismal creeds of the Churches.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if Moses and the Prophets had all taught a false doctrine, and encouraged a delusive hope, how obviously necessary was it that Jesus, who declared of himself “to this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I might bear witness to the truth”—how obviously necessary—how especially incumbent was it upon him, that in preaching to a people who relied upon Moses and the prophets, he should have exposed the error, and taken the utmost pains to eradicate it from their minds. But, did he do so, Sir? Turn to the accounts we have of his preaching and show me where. You cannot show me where. Mr. Lee cannot. The Gospel is a system of divine mercy and grace.—The conditions are repentance, faith and obedience.

John the Baptist, the forerunner of Jesus, taught the efficacy of repentance, and the necessity of real, personal righteousness in order to acceptance with God.

Christ was a preacher of repentance and righteousness. God sent him to bless the Jews first, and afterwards the Gentiles, but it was, as Peter declared, “*by turning them from their iniquities.*” Acts iii. 26—not as brother Lee would have us suppose by “dying as the sinner's substitute,” but by raising the sinner from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. Jesus declared (Mark ii. 17) that the leading object of his mission was “to call sinners to repentance.”

In his sermon on the Mount, Christ taught not a syllable about the necessity of his dying to satisfy divine justice. If he did let brother Lee show me where. He taught that to do the will of God, and to seek to become like him is the way to gain admittance into heaven; that the condition, on which we may hope for forgiveness, is that we forgive others. He inculcates throughout that sermon perfect morality, impartial benevolence, and self-sacrificing adherence to the law of righteousness, and at its close (although there is not a word in it about the orthodox scheme of salvation) he declares emphatically in an impressive figure,

the safety, i. e. the salvation of every man, who would hear and do what he had been saying.

One of the first acts of Christ's ministry, as related by John, is his conversation with Nicodemus, in which he assures him that nothing but a repentance so entire, that it would evince a complete change of heart, and be as it were a new birth, would suffice to bring him, or any other selfish, worldly minded man, into the kingdom of heaven; but he did not intimate to the ruler a word about brother Lee's doctrine.

Jesus taught that men will be accepted or rejected, according to the use they make of the talents entrusted to them; and that when brought to judgment they will be accepted or rejected, not according to their belief or unbelief in such doctrine as Mr. Lee declares to be the only ground of his hope, but according as they have or have not fed the hungry, clothed the naked, comforted the afflicted, relieved the suffering, and delivered the oppressed—that is according as they have or have not shown their love of the Father, whom they could not see, by their love of the brethren, who were all about them.

When the young man came to him, anxiously inquiring of him, what he would do to inherit eternal life, he did not tell him to put his trust in any substitute that was to be offered, in any satisfaction that was to be made to the divine justice, but to keep the commandments, Mark x. 19. In his never-to-be-forgotten parable of the Prodigal Son, he represented God as accepting penitent sinners, just as a compassionate father would receive his offending child, when he saw him turn back from his folly, and evince a true penitence. Luke xv.

I wish sir, there was time for me to adduce more specimens of Christ's preaching—and then to go through the book of Acts, and remind you that his apostles preached in the same way—and then into their epistles and quote passage after passage, in which they declare that man will be received or rejected by God, according to their characters, their works, their repentance, faith and obedience.

But, sir, I must glance at a class of passages in the Epistles, upon which my brother Lee (as most orthodox men do,) rests his faith in

this doctrine of substitution, and satisfaction.

It is a significant fact, which I would have you bear in mind that his "scheme of salvation," which since the reformation has often been called Calvinistic, depends mainly upon the Epistles for its support. I do not know how it may be with other preachers of the "Doctrines of Grace," as with singular impertinence, they are called; but it is stated on good authority, that in the course of the twenty years, that Calvin ruled Geneva, he preached 588 sermons upon texts taken from the New Testament; but mark me, sir, not one of them, was a sentence which Jesus Christ had uttered. Now 369 of his texts were from the Epistles; 189 were from the Acts, and not one from the gospels. But let it pass.

There are in the Epistles numerous passages which argue about Christ's death as a sacrifice for sin (as in one sense it undoubtedly was) a propitiation, and in one instance and in only one as an atonement. These passages are too numerous for me to quote in the brief time that is left me. Nor is it necessary, for they are familiar to all my orthodox hearers, and Mr. Lee has quoted many of them.

I have only time to suggest the principle upon which they ought to be expounded, so that they may be in accordance with the preaching of Christ; and not *another gospel*. I mean the principle, which would take into consideration the purpose, which the apostles had in writing those letters; and the previous religious faith and opinions of the persons to whom they were addressed. The Jews were a mercantile, trading people, and at the commencement of the Christian era; their nation was in subjection to the Roman Emperor, they were scattered throughout the Empire, living and doing business in all the principal cities. But wherever they went they carried their regard for the religion of their fathers—and as Christianity was first preached to the Jews, so everywhere the first converts to the new religion were for the most part from amongst those who believed in the Mosaic Law and the Ritual. To engraft the religion of Christ upon the religion of Moses was the first work the Apostles found that it was given them to do; and to prune off and cast away whatsoever of the old vine would overshadow, or vitiate the

growth of the new. This was no easy task, for men, then as now, clung to whatever had been given to them in their childhood as religion. The Apostles therefore recur frequently to this part of their work. Sacrifices for sin were a prominent part of the Jewish worship and although often shown by the Prophets and Psalmists to be of no value excepting as expressions of sentiments of dependence, and sorrow for delinquencies in duty, yet as they were outward, and some of them imposing they came to be regarded by the people as of great value in themselves; just as now-a-days a man's piety is by a great many people measured more by the number of prayers that he says, than by the conformity of his conduct to the will of God.

To correct the mistake of their Jewish converts, who were not only anxious to continue in the observance of the Mosaic ritual, but to enforce the observance of it upon those who might join their churches from amongst the Gentiles, the Apostles were obliged to labor to convince those, who had been Jews, that they would give up nothing essential if they should abandon the Ritual of Moses—that circumcision was not any thing of importance, nor uncircumcision; but a new creation, was the thing to be longed for, a change of heart and life to be wrought in all who would truly embrace Christ and his righteousness.

This principle to be adopted in the exposition of the sacrificial language of the Apostles is so clearly and beautifully stated in a discourse by Rev. J. H. Allen, formerly of Washington city, now of Bangor, Maine, that I shall use his language rather than my own. See his "Discourse on the Orthodoxy," p. 97. The epistle to the Hebrews (which was very probably written by Apollos, the friend of Paul) endeavours, from first to last, to meet the Hebrew prejudices, and reconcile the Jews to the simplicity of the Christian faith. This could be done only through the medium of their previous ideas. Christianity, without priest or ritual, was a thing they could not comprehend: and even those inclined towards the new religion contemplated this feature of it with vague terror and dislike. Now the apostle must show, if possible, *on Jewish principles*, how the ritual not only might be, but

actually had been, done away. One main point of his argument may be stated thus. On the great annual festival of Atonement, or expiation, the high-priest went within the veil of the temple, and sprinkled the blood of the victim on the mercy-seat, expiating thus the thousand legal offences for which due propitiation had not been already made. At that moment the burden of legal debt was lifted off from the entire people; and while he remained within the veil, the usual sacrifices were superseded. Now Christ, the great high-priest of the new dispensation, had passed with his own blood as victim, behind the veil of mortality, to the mercy-seat, or immediate presence of God. By the strictest interpretation of the Jewish law, all sacrifices are therefore suspended; and on their own principles, while he is within the veil, the ceremonial worship is no longer required.—Christ's peculiar fitness, both as priest (for he is near to us in human sympathy, and can "be touched with the feeling of our infirmities") and as victim (for in the innocence of his life he is "a lamb without spot or blemish"), is elaborately argued and illustrated; and the reasoning is brought to a focus, as it were, by comparing the 16th Chap. of Leviticus with the 9th of this Epistle.

But there was still another point that gave uneasiness to the mind of Jews taught to believe implicitly in the ancient faith. Among the rest, the sacred line of the priesthood, unbroken from the time of Aaron, must not be broken in upon, they thought; and even granting Christ to be such a priest as was needed in the new dispensation, how will he satisfy this claim? To answer this, the writer reminds them of a royal priest, who lived in old traditional times. long before Aaron, to whom Abraham himself, the father of the faithful, did honor; far higher, then, in dignity than any son of Abraham could be. And here, he says, is just such a priest as Christ. This Melchisedek,—without any recorded father or mother; of whom you know not so much as when he began to live or when he died,—he is the great royal priest of our ancient history. God's own anointing gave him his princely dignity,—not any hereditary descent; and just so it is with Christ."

I must leave this statement of the principle

on which I should interpret the passages that Mr. Lee has brought forward to sustain the doctrine he has announced of sacrifice and substitution, of satisfaction and atonement. I do not pretend, Sir, that every one of the passages in the Epistles admits of a perfectly easy explanation upon this principle. But almost all of them do—and if, on the authority of a few passages not easily explained, we adopt the doctrine of my brother Lee, then must we set aside the plainest declarations respecting the condition of acceptance, made by Moses the Psalmists, the Prophets, John the Baptist, Christ himself, and his Apostles, in all their discourses that have come down to us.

But Sir, when Mr. Lee urges the satisfaction made to divine justice by the death of Christ as the only ground of the sinner's hope, I fear he has not considered what an imputation he is casting upon the character of the Heavenly Father—the imputation that he is more like an inexorable monarch than a benignant parent. What should we think if a father, in an age and a country where the father had absolute power over his children, even to the disposal of their lives—who, on the return of a son, that had incurred his sovereign displeasure by a misdeed against which was denounced the loss of an eye or a hand, should refuse him pardon though his repentance and grief could not be doubted, and still insist upon the infliction of the penalty, unless another son who had never disobeyed the least of his commandments, touched with a feeling of compassion for his brother's sufferings, should come forward and suffer in his stead the penalty of the law—what should we think of a father who should press his justice to such an extent and accept of such a substitute?—and what should we say of the offender who could wish or consent to be relieved on such terms.

Then I ask, if the law is or can be honored or sustained by the infliction of its penalties, so much as it is by the submission of those who have offended against it? What can make a law or a law-giver appear so venerable as the acknowledgements of penitent transgressors, that they have found the way of transgression hard, that they have learnt by bitter experience that the law against which they have offended

is a righteous, a wise, a merciful requirement; and that they can never be at peace themselves until they have become wholly obedient to it.

All the reasonings that I ever heard or read in support of this doctrine my friend prizes so highly, were based upon analogies drawn from earthly monarchs and human governments. But if the administrators of human law could only discern the hearts of men, so as to know certainly when they have repented, what need would there be of inflicting any punishment for past transgression? The sorrow and shame, that a truly repentant heart always feels, are punishment enough; and the eager return of such a one to obedience is the highest tribute that can be paid to the majesty of the law. This would be perfectly so under the divine government, where no pretences of penitence can escape detection—and where only the truly contrite heart, those who do works meet for repentance, can be received.

But sir, there are many serious objections to the doctrine of Mr. Lee. It is inconsistent with his doctrine of the perfectly divine nature of Christ. For if he argues as undoubtedly he does, that God the Father is a being so holy, so pure, so just and exact in all his demands, that he cannot look upon iniquity without abhorrence, nor remit the punishment due to the sinner, unless the honor of his offended law be sustained by some one's enduring the penalty in the sinner's stead. If he argues thus from the holiness, purity, justice of the Father—what can he say of the Son but to allow that his holiness is less perfect, his purity less nice, his justice less stern—so that he can so pity the sinner as to be willing even to suffer in his stead. Here then his argument militates against the equality of the Son in these respects which I have named, and shows him to be inferior to the Father; unless indeed it shall be made to appear that in mercy the Son so far transcends the Father as himself to become the superior of the two.

Hear another objection sir, to this doctrine of my brother, on which he bases all his hopes. It is argued in its behalf—he must argue I think in the same way—that unless Christ the substitute for sinners be an infinite being, he cannot pay the penalty, for as sin is an offence committed against an infinite being, it is an infinite evil, and therefore demands a satisfaction that

no finite being can pay. Sir, there are several gross fallacies in this mode of reasoning.

1. If an offence committed against God by a man be an infinite evil because of the infinity of the being offended, by parity of reasoning, the satisfaction that may be made by a man, if accepted, would become infinite because made to an infinite being, just as much as the offence was committed against him.

Then again : for the same reason, the sin of an individual is an infinite evil; therefore there must be as many infinite evils to be atoned for as there are or have been individual sinners—that is very many millions. But it will not be pretended that Christ himself is more than one infinite being—so that even he, according to this scholastic reasoning—even he, can atone for the sin of only one man, and all the rest must go unredeemed.

But why should the infinity of God attach to the offence committed against him any more than his other divine attributes? For no reason that I can conceive of—therefore we may ascribe omnipotence, omniscience, invisibility, unchangeableness to the sins of men just as much as infinity.

But is my brother in sober earnestness when he alleges that the infinite satisfaction of Christ's death is the only foundation of the sinner's hope? What, if Christ be not God and capable of making an infinite satisfaction, will it follow that God hath ceased to be love; that the riches of his grace are exhausted; that he will no longer show mercy and forgive; that the promises and declarations of the gospel are not true? Is not the love and mercy of God infinite? Have they not existed in him from all eternity? Are they not essential parts of his character, of his nature? Nowhere in the Scriptures is the supposed satisfaction made by Christ's death, placed before sinners as the ground of their hope; but the rich mercy and free grace of God in him.

ELEVENTH EVENING—MARCH 23.

MR. LEE'S FIRST SPEECH.

In thinking over the themes appropriate to this last evening of this discussion, I am unable to introduce all that I deem important and necessary. There are so many things that need attention I shall find it necessary to bring to bear my most powerful condensing apparatus.

So that without many words I shall proceed straight forward to notice his replies to my arguments before offered to your notice on the subject of the Trinity.

1. He entirely misrepresents my argument.

Once he represented me as holding to three beings in the Godhead, and once as holding to three Gods. On this rested the whole force of his arguments. I have made no such representations, but have before corrected him in this particular, and am sorry that he persists in it. It only proves that my argument cannot be assailed until it is misrepresented.

He accuses me of proving it by legerdemain. Has he no better reply than such a charge. It is an admission that the argument cannot be answered.

The facts are these :

We agree that there is but one God. I affirm that in the Godhead there is a three-fold personal distinction, of Father Son and Holy Ghost. The existence of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, he admits, but denies their undivided divinity. I prove that they are all divine. One of two consequences must follow, viz. there are three Gods, or these three personal distinctions exist in unity of the one Godhead. If he could answer my arguments and disprove their divinity, he would have no occasion to talk of three beings, and three Gods, but failing to do this, he has no hope left but to affirm that my argument proves the existence of three Gods. This is a departure from the rules of debate. See Hedges Logic, Rule II. page 161. That the three-fold distinction exist in the Godhead, he admits may be true, by agreeing to debate it with me.

But when the distinction is proved he refuses to explain it by the Trinity in unity which may be true, and rushes upon the conclusion which both of us agree cannot be true.

He says that I am bound to prove that the three are one. Not so. We agree that there is but one God, and I am bound to prove the distinction of persons in the Godhead, which I have done. But he is bound to disprove the distinction, that there is no Father, Son and Holy Ghost in Unity of the Godhead, not that there are three Gods, for that we have both agreed cannot be true.

2. His attempted play upon my remark, that

the Father is God in the highest sense, was worse than trifling. I said highest sense, not in comparison with the sense in which I hold Christ to be God, but in reference to his assertion that Christ was called God in a subordinate sense. That was no admission on my part of a higher and lower sense. I affirm that he ought to know better than to reason thus.

3. His assertion that it was not necessary to notice my Scriptures quoted to prove the Trinity, was undoubtedly the easiest way of disposing of them.

The plural form of the name of God, with the expression, let us make man in our own image, would prove that a man must be a trinity if it proves any thing. This was his only reply on this point.

Well, can he prove that every man is not a trinity? I do not admit that any such consequence follows, but if it did, it would not alarm me. Philosophers divide the mind into the intellect, the affections, and the will, and yet there is but one mind. Paul speaks of man as composed of a spirit and soul and body, and yet there is but one man where this trinity in unity is found.

4. His explanation of the scene at Christ's baptism is based wholly upon a false view of God. He contends that the Father speaking from heaven, and the Son coming up out of the water, and the Holy Ghost descending, could not all three have been God in the three localities, or if they were, they were three Gods.

But God is every where at all times, but not everywhere manifest at the same time and in the same manner.

But God could manifest himself in the three places at the same time, and still there be but one God. My friend reasons as though his God was just like his Saviour, a man who can be in but one place at the same time.

5. The form of Baptism appears to trouble him. How men can worship and be dedicated to God, and a creature, a man, and an attribute at the same time is not easy even for him to explain. By the Father he understands God. By the Son he understands a man, the Son of one Joseph, called Jesus Christ, and by the Holy Ghost he understands the power of God, that divine energy by which the gospel

was attended. But this does not meet my argument, nor relieve his. It still follows that we are baptised in the name of and consecrated to one God, one man and one manifestation, power or energy of God.

But look at his reasons. He justifies the use of the name of the Son in this relation, on the ground of the preceding verse, which says:

"All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."

Now, unless he existed in unity of the Godhead, God emptied himself of his omnipotence and became powerless, for two distinct beings could not possess all power at the same time. Again, how does it appear that Christ, being only a man, the Son of Joseph, once the babe that slumbered in the manger at Bethlehem, possessing only the essential elements of humanity, could have a capacity to receive all power in heaven and in earth. It was proved in an argument which has not been noticed by my opponent, that to receive and exercise almighty power, as a communication from God, there must first be an infinite capacity which humanity has not got and never can have. But waving all this, and admitting that he did receive all power in heaven and in earth, as a distinct being from the Father, then the Father must have ceased to possess all power at the same time, and the consequence is that there must have been a powerless God, and an almighty man. Such are the terrible absurdities upon which my opponent is driven. But if you admit the divinity of Christ and the distinction in the unity of the Godhead, these difficulties all vanish.

So with reference to baptism in the name of the Holy Ghost. By the Holy Ghost he understands the divine energy which accompanied the gospel. But an energy has no existence distinct from the operative agents in which it resides, hence, if my friend admits the personal distinction between the Father and the Holy Ghost, as existing in the unity of the Godhead, he gives up the argument, if he denies it he is involved in the absurdity of baptising in the name of God and a manifestation of God's energy.

It only remains for me to notice the authorities he referred to in this connection.

He first referred to Thomas Jefferson and

quoted from a letter of his to John Quincy Adams.

Thomas Jefferson was a great politician, and as such I respect him, but he was a Deist and did not believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures. As this is a Bible question exclusively, there must be a famine in the land of evidence, when openly avowed Deists are quoted as authority. As he has quoted St. Jefferson, I might with a better grace quote St. Daniel, I mean Daniel Webster, who, when inquired of, how a man of his mind could believe that one is three and three one, is said to have answered I know some things, but I do not profess to understand the arrithmetic of heaven. He declared that the three greatest minds of England rejected the doctrine of the Trinity, viz. Milton, Lock and Newton.

Suppose it were true, what does it prove? Three men against all England and the Christian world. He has told you that the forty-seven learned men who translated our present revision of the Bible from the original Greek and Hebrew, were all Trinitarian. Moreover, every distinguished commentator that has ever wrote on the whole Bible has been a Trinitarian, and all the learned authorities which he has so repeatedly pretended to quote against me were all Trinitarians. Does not this weigh as much as the three men he claims. But I cannot even allow him this, for I have never yet seen the proof that Lock and Newton were not Trinitarians. And as to Milton, any one who has read his master Poem, knows that he believed in the pre-existence of Christ, since he describes him as victor on the battle plains of heaven when angels fell, before the Eden of earth felt the blight of sin.

I. His reply on the atonement in no sense met my arguments. Those arguments were clear and unanswerable, and he did not attack one of them, nor notice the texts which I quoted in proof.

II. He asserted the sufficiency of repentance.

1. The necessity of repentance and all good works, as there is opportunity, I maintain as strongly as he can. All this was a misapprehension of the question. He argued as though I held that the atonement superseded the necessity of repentance and good works, which is a misrepresentation.

But repentance and good works are not sufficient without the atonement for the following reasons.

1. They would never and could never have existed without the atonement. All grace and divine influence communicated to man since the fall of Adam, which alone leads to repentance and good works, is by virtue of the atonement. This atonement was made available prospectively from the moment that God declared that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. To this all the sacrifices pointed from that which smoked upon Abel's altar to the time when Jesus died. Hence we read.

"And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission."—Heb. ix. 22.

That sacrificial worship was instituted by God, and it can have no significance if it be not typical of the atonement by Christ.

2. Repentance cannot put away sin, because it arises as one of the consequences of sin, and an effect can never destroy the cause in which has its existence.

3. Future obedience added to repentance, cannot remove sin, because to be sober to day, will not remove the guilt of having been drunk yesterday.

4. It was shown in an argument not answered, that a pardon cannot be granted on the ground of mere goodness. That argument was based upon the perfections of God, and is unanswerable, but I add, pardon on such a ground would make a nullity of the law. It would make God appear as giving a law the penalty of which he will never inflict. Such a pardon would have to be repeated as often as a moral being may choose to sin, which would be subversive of all moral government.

5. Such a pardon would be subversive of public injustice. God is just as well as merciful, and he can no more be unjustly merciful, than he can be justly unmerciful or mercifully unjust. The atonement shows God's hatred of sin, and goes as far to condemn sin in the eyes of the moral universe as the damnation of a fallen world could.

MR. MAY'S FIRST SPEECH.

As I trust all persons who mean to judge fairly between me and my opponent, will read the published report of this discussion, and faithfully compare what each of us have said, I shall not spend time in reply to many things that have just fallen from Mr. Lee. I can only assure him that I am utterly unable to discern any difference between a *person* and a *being*. If he can prove that there are three persons in the Godhead, he can prove just as well that there are three beings—three Gods in one. But as I showed the other evening, he signally failed in that part of his argument, as he needs must. When you see it in print, you will see that he failed.

What he said just now, about a Trinity in man, was no illustration of the Trinity he is contending for. He referred to what may be called three attributes of the human mind, just as power, wisdom, and love are three attributes of God. But he would have us believe that three persons, each of whom possesses all the divine attributes, are yet but one God.

As to the opinions of Milton, Locke, and Newton, he cannot maintain his opposition to the statement I made. Each of those very great and very good men saw reasons, and gave his reasons for disbelieving the doctrine of the Trinity.

Mr. Lee has tried to nullify the testimony of President Jefferson, because, he says, he was an infidel. I introduced him, the other evening, as a strong-minded and clear-headed man, who saw and declared the egregio us inconsistency of the doctrine of the Trinity, which, perhaps, was the very thing that repelled him from the system held up as Christianity, and helped to make him an infidel.

With these few comments, I leave my friend's speech to-night, with you and our readers, and proceed to other matters.

I congratulate you, sir, and my respected auditors, that this protracted discussion is to close to-night. Not that I have said all that I should wish to say upon the subject we have had in debate. Far otherwise, I regret to leave many topics so partially developed as I have been obliged to leave them, because I fear my meaning cannot be fully apprehended. But we have made too large a demand upon your time and patience, sir, and upon the public attention. With sincere thanks to you, therefore, for the patient and impartial manner in which you have

presided, and to our fellow-citizens, for the numerous and respectful attendances they have given to us from the beginning to the end, we shall release you, them, and ourselves at the close of this evening.

You may have thought, sometimes, that I have digressed more than was necessary from the direct line of argument. But consider, sir, I pray, that if I had followed Mr. Lee step by step, taking up every text he had laid down, and giving my interpretation of it, and my reasons for interpreting it differently from what he had done, I could not, in the time allowed, have traveled over half the ground he did, and should have left my argument in a much more unfinished state than I now leave it. It has seemed to me altogether better to explain, as far as I could, incidentally, the principles of biblical interpretation, and give specimens of their use in application to the prominent texts, on which my opponent and all Trinitarians mainly rely for the support of their doctrine, leaving it for him and them, under the guidance of the same principles, to explain many other passages of less importance, which I have not had time to notice.

I beg you, further, to consider, that probably the larger, much the larger part of our auditors, have come here already believing the doctrine that has been the subject of discussion : hoping and expecting that my opponent would easily establish the proposition he offered to maintain, and as easily expose my error. They came here, taught from their childhood that there is a Trinity of persons in the one God ; accepting the philosophy of that theological system which rests upon that strange dogma ; and familiar with the common acceptation of those texts of Scripture which are usually alleged in its support. Nay, more, sir, is it not probable that many have come to this discussion their minds pre-occupied with a horror of Unitarianism, as if it were the doctrine of devils! How, then, could it be expected that I should content myself with barely replying to such arguments as my opponent might see fit to urge in behalf of his proposition. I came not here to measure my skill with Mr. Lee's as a tactician in debate. I came, sir, to do what the occasion might permit me, to unfold, and establish a great truth, that has been obscured and almost put out of sight by the theology of the Churches. It has been indispensably necessary that I should point out and hold up to view the exceeding in-

consistencies, contradictions, and absurdities involved in the proposition my opponent had undertaken to maintain—The 1st Article of the creed of his own Church, and of most of the orthodox Churches in the land.

It has been necessary for me to expose the erroneous principle of interpretation applied by my friend to the Scriptures he has quoted : to show you that very distinguished Trinitarian writers have differed from him, as widely as I do, in their understanding of those Scriptures ; and not to conceal from our auditors the fact that the Scriptures themselves have been corrupted by some man, or men, in olden times, to favor the doctrine of the Triune God.

This has been tacitly acknowledged by my friend, in respect to the famous text, 1st John, v. 7, "There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost ; and these three are one."

If he had been able to vouch for the genuineness of this text, he would not have failed to quote it, as it would have been more to his purpose than any he has been able to adduce.

All these necessary incidentals have occupied much time that might otherwise have been devoted directly to answering Mr. Lee's arguments and proof texts. But I trust, sir, that by pursuing the course I have taken, I have put some who have heard me into possession of facts that will enable them to discover for themselves the truth on this great subject.

Mr. Lee has repeatedly more than intimated that my logic was defective. Sir, I have not so much confidence in logic as many seem to have. Logicians have played, and do play, such queer pranks with the truth, that I distrust them. When a logician proves, as the ablest one of our day has done, that there never was such a man as Napoleon Bonaparte—though I am aware he is only showing what logical argumentation can do, he makes me feel afraid to rely upon an instrument that can be wielded against the most palpable truths almost as successfully as against the deadliest errors. When a man proves so clearly, as Bishop Berkley did by his logic, that there is no external world, that it is only an impression upon the mind—that even our own existence is only an idea, not a reality—I am as sure that he is mistaken as I am that I have a body and a mind. Should a man succeed in proving by his logic, that in the one living and true God there are three equal, infinite and eternal persons, and yet but one, I am ■■■■■

dent that he is in error as I am that Mathematics is a more exact science than logic : that numbers convey more definite ideas than words. And should a man prove by the mighty logic of Dr. Edwards, or Mr. Finney, that such are the divine decrees, and the fore-ordination of God, and the inexorability of his government, and the character of his justice, and the nature of man—that the gift of existence will be, to a vast majority of the human race, an eternal and excruciating curse, I know it would be a lie, as certainly as I know that God is true and good.

Truth, sir, is to be seen, not in a factitious glare, which an able reasoner may throw around it, but in the clear light that shines forth from itself. Truth is in its very nature luminous. It is an emanation from God himself. It is the light which lighteth every man who cometh into the world, to the extent that he is able or willing to receive it.

My opponent may be a logician, sir, but what has his logic proved ? what can it prove against the simple statement of the contradiction and absurdity inherent in the proposition he has undertaken to defend ? This doctrine of the Trinity was fully defined, and very carefully guarded at all points, in the creed by the name of St. Athanasius, which early in the 5th century of the Christian era, was established as the faith of the Church, "which except a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved." The Roman Emperor, Theodosius, decreed its truth ; and all the powers of the State combined to enforce it. For centuries opposition was pretty much silenced, or was heard only in the murmers of individual discontent, from time to time, through the long ages of darkness that ensued. At the revival of learning, and under the quickening influence of the Protestant Reformation, the discussion of this doctrine was renewed. Some of the greatest biblical scholars, and, at the same time, according to the confession of their enemies, some of the purest and most pious of the contemporaries of Luther and Calvin, opposed the doctrine of the Trinity ; and since that day the doctrine has been stated and believed in almost as many different ways as there are words in the proposition. So that it were very unsafe to pretend to know what a man really believes, because he professes to believe in the Trinity.

Strange as you may think it, the difference o belief, between my brother Lee and myself, is not quite so great as may at first be supposed ;

that is, if I understand the concessions he has made in the course of our discussion.

Mr. Lee—I have made no concessions.

Mr. May—I think it will appear that you have made some important ones.

We each of us differ from the Arians, who believe that Christ was a pre-existent, superangelic being, more than we differ from each other. Mr. Lee believes, as he has said here again and again, that Jesus Christ was a man, as much as I do. Both of us maintain, that he had a human body and a human soul; that he was subject to our physical infirmities, and "was tempted in all points like as we are." Then on the other hand, I believe as much as he does, that God was with Jesus; that he manifested himself to the world in him; spake by his mouth, and wrought miracles at his hand.

But then my brother assumes that he has the more exalted idea of the nature of Christ, inasmuch as he believes, that God was *so* united as somehow (in a mysterious manner) to constitute him a person equal with God. And yet I cannot gather from my brother, that he believes the human nature of Christ was converted into Deity by the union. No: all the while that Jesus was on earth, while he was doing the works of God (as Mr. Lee alleges) and receiving the worship of God, his human nature remained the same, liable to hunger, thirst, fatigue and death; his soul, so far from being incapable of suffering, as the Almighty must always be, was agonized in Gethsemane, and upon the cross. Certainly the body that died, and the soul that was in agony could not have been in any sense the eternal, unchangeable Jehovah; and if I understand my brother, he acknowledges that they were not, but were parts only of the human nature of Christ.

Therefore, Sir, not to speak again of the *unintelligibility* of Mr. Lee's hypothesis, I am unable to see, that there is any thing in it, by which Christ is exalted higher than he is by the doctrine which I maintain. For I believe that Jesus of Nazareth, having a material body and a human soul like any other man, in which he suffered physical pain and mental anguish, was yet a man sanctified, endued with the spirit of God not by measure, and sent into the world to redeem it. I believe that he performed the wonderful works, and evinced the divine wisdom, which are attributed to him in the New Testament, which no one could have done, "except God had been with him."

You see then, I do not believe, as Mr. Lee

has often alleged, that the Saviour was a mere man, but a man endowed with divine wisdom and divine power. And I put my trust not in what was merely human in him, but in what was evidently divine. Now I ask if my friend Lee has a faith, which either intelligibly or practically amounts to any more? If he has, he certainly has not made it appear in this discussion. He and all other Trinitarians seem to me to be clinging to an inexplicable idea of something, which they call "the two natures of Christ," or what some used to call a *hypostatic union*, which is a very convenient phrase to signify they know not what.

In answer to my question the other evening, "in what sense was Christ the Son of God?" Mr. Lee replied "*in what sense is any Christian a child of grace, a son of God, who is begotten by the Holy Ghost?*" Verily I think that answer implies that, after all, brother Lee's idea of the sonship of Christ is very much like my own.

Here some may be ready to inquire, why, if I see the difference between my Trinitarian neighbors' faith and my own to be, after all, not so very great as has been supposed,—why I am so out-spoken and earnest in my opposition to their doctrine of the tri-one God? I answer first, because, unscriptural, irrational and utterly unintelligible as that doctrine is, they make more account of it, than of all Christ's preaching and character. They regard a man's belief of this doctrine, or assent to it, as a better evidence of his soundness in faith, than the most upright conduct, and the most benevolent affections, manifested by him in all the relations and intercourses of life. They throw distrust upon the only test of a true faith, which Jesus proposed, when he said "by their fruits ye shall know them;" and set up a test of admission into the Christian Church, and of acceptance with God, which was no where prescribed by Christ or his apostles; and which is no evidence of righteousness of life, or holiness of heart.

The second reason for my opposition to this doctrine of the three-one God, is that it is made the basis of a system of doctrines, which has as little resemblance to Christianity, as any thing that can be found in the theologies of the heathen world; a system of doctrines, in which the character of God is fearfully misrepresented; the nature of man frightfully distorted or caricatured; and the destiny of the greater part of the human race is declared to be far worse

than that of "the brutes which perish;" a system of doctrines, which has alienated from Christianity many of the best minds of every age, if it has not driven them into blank infidelity—discountenanced the personal, independent, thorough study of the Scriptures for oneself, and made religion to be too generally considered a supernatural condition, that is superinduced upon the favored few, "the elect," the number of which was determined before the foundation of the world; and represents that even they are to be saved not because of any faith or good works in them, but wholly in consideration of the righteousness of Christ imputed to them, or in some inexplicable manner transferred to them; so that this system of theology has made the righteousness of men, (their individual and joint efforts to do the will and accomplish the purposes of God,) of little or no consequence, compared with their acceptance of this dismal creed of the churches. The Gospel of Christ has been supplanted by this theology of the Christian Fathers of the third and fourth centuries, and the work of the Lord has been every where hindered.

I rejoice to acknowledge that many, who have been entangled by their education in the intricacies of this labyrinth of inconsistencies, have yet been so affected by the divine precepts and the perfect character, and simple doctrines of Christ, that they have listened to the responses of the spirit in their own hearts, and have become likewise the dear children of God, true Christians. But the number of these is every where far less, than it would have been, if all of Christianity and nothing of Calvinism had been every where preached and inculcated. The dark system of theology, however, still stands dominant in most of the churches, and diffuses a baleful influence throughout Christendom.

Within the last sixty or seventy years, this system of terrible error has been more vigorously assailed than ever before in England and this country; and, aided as the assault has been by improvements in the education of the people, and changes for the better in man's notions of civil government, an impression not to be effaced has been made upon this citadel of orthodoxy. Man's attention has been directed more than ever to the practical requirements of Christianity. And just within the period I have named more has been done directly than ever before, since the primitive age of the church, to enlighten and save mankind. And,

Sir, in the only part of the world where Unitarianism has ever attained any thing like the ascendancy, there, just there (in Boston and its vicinity) more plans have been devised for the relief of suffering humanity, and more has been done in their behalf, than any where else.

Nevertheless, Sir, the system of Calvinism so called still remains, upheld by all the power of the Papal Church, domiciled as the dependencies of that church are in every part of the world; upheld by the Church of England, sustained as it is by that mighty monarchy; upheld in our country by the offspring of the English establishment—the Episcopal Church; and upheld by the venerable Presbyterian Church; and by the Methodist and Baptist Churches that give it a qualified support. True, Professor Maurice of England, and Prof. Crosby of New Hampshire, and Dr. Bushnell of Hartford, and Prof. Fitch of New Haven, and Dr. Beecher of Boston, and others, have each and all from within, made great breaches in the foundations of this system of error. Still it stands; and so long as it stands in the holy place, where the Gospel of Christ alone should be enshrined, so long ought the ministers of Christ to assail it. My brother frankly acknowledges to me, that the creeds of the Presbyterian and Episcopal churches are stated in language, which has become obsolete. "No Trinitarian," to use his own words, "can be found, who if he were called upon to state his views, would state them in the exact language of either of those creeds." Why, then, should those creeds be retained a day or an hour longer? Let them be laid away among the *things of the past*; and let the people, all the people, be encouraged and assisted to study the Bible and the volumes of nature and providence, "remembering" in the words of the venerable John Robinson in his parting charge to the church, that came to Plymouth, "that there is more light yet to break out from them all;" and assured that he who shall learn from them to love truth and hate error; to dread all wrong, and try to practise all righteousness, to recognize impartially all the rights of all his fellow men; to abhor oppression and cruelty, and love justice and mercy;—in a word, he who shall have so learnt, as "to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world," he, and he only, has learnt that, which has made him wise unto salvation, let his theological opinions be

MR. LEE'S SECOND SPEECH.

As a matter of course, it is impossible for me now to give particular attention to the point my opponent may make in his last addresses. For I have now before me more than matter enough to occupy the time allotted me, and may be compelled to overrun my time, or transcend the limits agreed on.

Before resuming my reply to points made previously by Mr. May, I remark, that it is my last address. I have no opportunity to reply to anything he may say in his closing speech. It is always understood however, that no new matter is to be introduced in the closing address, and I have no doubt that my friend will abide this universally recognized rule. I do not know what he may have to offer in his last remarks, but I am quite sure that he will not do me any harm, he will not certainly break any of my bones! It is not in his heart. And I ask my audience if he advances any arguments that I have not examined, that they will take it for granted, that if I had the opportunity, I would examine them and use them up just ■ carefully, tenderly and softly as I have used up all the arguments I have noticed.

There is one point more I wish to notice. The other evening Mr. May passed over my rejoinder to his exposition of the temptation of the Saviour, and instead of answering my arguments announced that he would repeat ■ sermon in his own church on next Sunday evening. I have of course no objection to his repeating his sermon once, twice or thrice. Nor do I complain that he has transferred ■ portion of this discussion to his own pulpit; but seeing that he has led off in this direction, I too will announce a sermon. On next Sabbath evening I will preach ■ sermon in the First Presbyterian church on the existence and influence of Devils. I will now resume my remarks where they were suspended at the close of my first speech.

6. This view of pardon which I have advocated on the ground of the atonement, does not represent God as a tyrant, but magnifies his goodness and love:

John iii. 16: "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that who-

soever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life."

These are the words of Christ himself, and will weigh with my friend. In perfect harmony with this are the words of Paul.

"For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." Rom. v. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

The love of God is seen in the gift of his Son to suffer and die, and the love of Christ is seen in his voluntary death for us. As Paul exclaims "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." 2 Cor. v. 14, 15.

And that his death for all was an equal manifestation of the love of the Father has not only been proved, but is declared, Heb. ii. 9: "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man."

The tasting of death was not of hatred, but of the grace of God. It was by the grace of God that he tasted death for every man. But my friend says it is cruelty if he died for sinners. Then is the Bible wrong, or cruelty and grace are the same thing.

But if this be cruelty, we have more revelations of God's cruelty, and that too in the words of Jesus Christ.

My friend denied twice during his argument that Christ in any one text represented himself as coming to die for sinners, or that he represented his death as the ground of hope.

Mr. May here said—"Oh no, I did not say so. I said there was no text saying that he came to die ■■■ substitute for sinners.

Mr. Lee.—I think you said the other too.

Mr. May.—No, I did not say so.

Mr. Lee—It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. May meant to deny that he did come as a substitute.

Mr. May.—Oh no, it does not amount to the same thing.

Mr. Lee continued.

How strange did this sound, after I had quoted and commented upon the text which affirms that he "came to give his life a ransom for many?" This text is found, Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45.

"I am the good shepherd : the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." This commandment have I received of my Father." John x. 11, 17, 18.

This text makes several points.

(1.) It proves that Christ did give his life for men.

(2.) It proves that his death was voluntary. "No man taketh it from me, I lay it down of myself."

(3.) It proves that he and the Father were united in this sacrifice of himself for "the sheep," that is men. "Therefore doth my Father love me because I lay down my life for the sheep." If this is cruelty, as my friend represents, then God delights in cruelty, insomuch that he loves the Son because he voluntarily submits to be tortured." You see, therefore, that the war of my friend is not so much with me as with God the Father, and with his Son our Lord Jesus Christ.

But I have not done with his denial that Christ taught that he came to die, and that his death is our only ground of hope.

"I am the living bread which came down from heaven : if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever : and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. John vi. 51.

Christ gave his flesh and his blood for the world by dying, in which his body was broken and his blood spilt. This is further proved by the sacramental supper instituted by his own hand.

"And, as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, brake it, and gave it, to the disciples, and said, take, eat ; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it : For this is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, 28.

And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed and brake it, and gave to them, and said, take, eat ; this is my body. And he took the cup ; and when he given thanks, he gave it to them : and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many. Mark xiv. 22, 23, 24.

"And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, this is my body which is given for you : this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, this cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you. Luke xxii. 16, 20.

These texts occurring in three of the gospels cannot be disputed. They teach beyond the power of doubt that Christ did represent himself as dying for the sins of men. "This is my blood which is shed for the remission of sins," cannot mean anything less, than that he died to procure the pardon of sinners. That it was understood in this sense is clear from the manner in which it is applied in the epistles and acts of the apostles.

My friend virtually admitted that the doctrine is taught in the epistles, yet he felt at liberty to reject it because as he assumed, it is not taught in the words of Christ. I have now proved that it is taught in the words of Christ, and hence, the doctrine as found in the epistles is to be looked upon, as the apostolic comment upon and application of the teachings of Christ.

I will quote but a few texts as time is short.

The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ. 1 Cor. x. 16.

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread : And when he had given thanks, he

brake it, and said, take, eat ; this is my body, which is broken for you : this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, this cup is the new testament in my blood ; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27.

The expression, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," explains the whole matter. Testament means covenant, which was sealed and rendered effectual by his blood. The whole sacramental scene becomes a farce if Christ did not die for the sins of men. One text from Paul.

" Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand : By which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures."—1 Cor. xv. 1-3.

Mr. May affirmed that the Jews did not believe in the doctrine of a vicarious sacrifice as the ground of pardon. Well, I have proved that Christ taught it, and now I will notice what they did believe. They were full of errors, but amid their errors there were some glimpses of truth. One of their Prophets said of Christ :

" Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him ; he hath put him to grief : when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand."—Isa. liii. 10.

" And one of them named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, Nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this spake he not of himself : but, being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation ; And not for that nation only, but that also he should gather

together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad."—John ii. 49-52.

This speaks for itself without comment from me.

The argument in proof that Christ did die for the sins of men is now placed beyond the power of contradiction, by those who pretend to believe the Scriptures.

He may talk of its injustice and cruelty, but that is only to talk against God and his plan of saving the world ; and when he declared that it would be mean to accept of pardon on such ground, he spit in the face of God Almighty's offer of mercy through Jesus Christ.

In reply to that, I can only say with the deepest sorrow in the language of Paul :—

" Beware therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophecies ; Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish : for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you."—Acts xiii. 40, 41.

I cannot refrain from noticing the representation that the goodness and mercy of God is a safe refuge for sinners without the death of Christ. For pure and sinless beings, the goodness of God is enough, but with sinners it is otherwise. The representations of the Scriptures are enough to alarm you if you will but heed them.

God spared not the angels that sinned but cast them down to hell, and delivered into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment. He spared not the old world.

He poured a storm of fire and brimstone, upon Sodom and the cities of the plain and burned them up.

" Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and a horrible tempest : this shall be the portion of their cup. For the righteous Lord loveth righteousness ; his countenance doth behold the upright."—Ps. ii. 6, 7.

Of their lot it is said :

" Where their worm dieth not." " Depart ye cursed" is the sentence. " These shall go away" it is said.

When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Such is the view of the Scriptures respecting

the fate of those who will not obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus, or who presumptuously peril their souls on the assumed sufficiency of the mercy of God without an atonement for sin.

I shall be obliged to omit my summing up for want of time. I had prepared a recapitulation of my entire argument. I had also prepared a summary of the points I have made to which there has been no attempt even at reply. But these must all be omitted. And I proceed to the concluding thoughts.

But what have been the principles developed, and the positions taken in the fruitless struggle against my theory and the arguments by which I have maintained it?

1. No systematic views have been advanced, constituting a harmonious whole of Christianity, upon which a thinking mind can take hold as the soul's sure anchor, and safely swing off from times narrow shores upon the broad bosom of an untried eternity. Negative propositions have been the principal developments, and the only faith that has been clearly brought to light, is a trust in all unbelief.

2. The sacred record has been invaded; text after text has been explained away, whole chapters have been blotted out; the authenticity of whole books has been questioned and the Bible has been pronounced a book of error.

Mr. May said—No that was not what I said I said; that there were errors in the Bible.

Mr. Lee—Then it is a book of errors if there are errors in it. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. May—No, it is a different thing.

3. The Saviour of mankind has been denied a pre-existence and a divine nature—has been dismantled of all that is superhuman, and placed before the world as the natural Son of Joseph and Mary, born after the flesh, a mere man. There has been presented in the place of that almighty every where omnipresent Saviour, who declares himself in every assembly, and always with his ministers even unto the end of the world, a man of the stature of one of us, who can be in but one place at the same time, presenting only a human arm for the whole world to hang their hopes upon, and to lean upon in successive millions as they tread the gloomy vale and go down into the waters of death.

4. The atonement has been denied as held by the saints in life, trusted in death, and sung in heaven—"Unto him that loved us and hath washed us from our sins in his own blood be glory and dominion forever; thou art worthy, for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood."

These absurd and fatal positions have been assailed, exposed and overthrown. I have not failed to look his arguments and positions full in the face, I have not shunned them as he has many of mine. I have not found it necessary to attack the Bible as he has done. I have not attempted to explain away a single text, or make it appear that any text does not mean what it appears to say. I have answered all the questions he has seen fit to ask, nor have I murmured or complained that he drew out of me what I would otherwise have concealed and what tends to prejudice my cause with the people.

And now I ask no credit for myself: I do not claim for myself the honor of a triumph, I claim it for the truth. What advantage I may have had in the argument I want it to be put down to the credit of truth, and not to my credit. Who am I to defend God's truth? I know my incompetency too well to take any credit to myself. Had I enjoyed the advantages of my friend in early life, it might have made me self-confident; but I came not up to the grapple laden with classic love, gathered from collegiate bowers.

I was thrown an orphan boy upon the cold bosom of the world among strangers, at the tender age of twelve years, since which time I have not had a father to guide my footsteps, nor a mother to smooth my pillow, or to wipe away my falling tears. I never had the advantages of a common school. I learned my letters where they had been cut for me with a penknife upon a shingle in the woods. All I know and all I have of literature and science I have acquired by private study, and it has been the price of many a weary hour and many a midnight lamp, which never burned so brightly as the love of knowledge and truth in my soul.

And now God hears me record, that I would sooner sink into non-existence than to deny the truth, or withhold my hand from its defense, or

allow it to suffer through my fault. It was this that brought me up to the battle; not that I thought myself able of myself, but I felt that truth was assailed, and that was enough, and ever has been enough to call me forth and ever shall be, until death sets his signet silent on my lips.

MR. MAY'S SECOND SPEECH.

Expressing once more the hope that you and all others will compare what I have said with what my opponent in this discussion has said, on all points, I have but a word in reply to his last remarks.

I am not surprised at the little impression my arguments seem to have made upon my brother Lee. I shall not be surprised to learn that many who have attended this discussion, have gone away unchanged in their opinion. Most of our auditors have been *educated* to believe the dogmas I have pronounced erroneous, and I know full well how tenacious we are of what we learnt in our childhood. Ask the missionaries, who have gone and spent scores of years in trying to convert to Christianity the most enlightened people of India, why they have made so little impression there, and they will tell you (will they not?) that their auditors were *educated to believe* just those things which Christianity pronounces erroneous. This is the difficulty I am contending against.

I shall not deny that my literary advantages in early life were, as Mr. Lee has alleged they were, greater than his. I hope I am not ungrateful to God, and to my earthly parents, who gave me what I enjoyed.

But, sir, as it now seems to me, the greatest favor bestowed upon me in early life, for which I cannot be thankful enough, was that I was never required to learn "the Assembly's Catechism," or anything like that digest of unintelligibilities. When I see what shackles that kind of teaching puts upon the intellects, what fetters upon the hearts of many of the wisest and best of people: when I hear the confessions of those who have broken out of that enclosure, I rejoice with unspeakable joy, that I was never put into it.

No, sir, my parents led me to read the Scriptures, and read them to me; especially such parts as I could most easily understand, more especially the gospel narratives. And that is the reason, probably, why I now believe that *true Christianity is to be learnt from the words, and seen in the life and character of Jesus Christ.*

The crowning error of that system, on which I commented so freely when I was up before, is the *Doctrine of Atonement*—the doctrine which teaches, if I understand Mr. Lee and many of the approved expositors of the orthodox faith, the doctrine which teaches that the righteousness of Christ (the second person of the God-head,) has been accepted as a substitute for the righteousness of man; and that his death, (though it was the death of only his human na-

ture,) was received as a satisfaction for the sins of the world, or at least of the elect.

If any doctrine could be devised that should excuse men from all efforts on their own behalf, I know not wherein it would differ from this. Why should we attempt to pay over again a debt that has once been discharged? Why should we attempt to acquire any righteousness of our own, if the righteousness of the all perfect one has been substituted for any that we may, or may not, obtain?

There is not time now to examine this doctrine thoroughly, nor is it the topic of this discussion. It was introduced by my brother Lee as the sixth and last reason why he must believe in the deity of Christ, because the world needed such a one to be a substitute—a satisfaction—a propitiation with the Father. Nothing else, he insisted, could save men. He declared that he, himself, has no other hope but in the atonement, which Christ made by his death.

I hope you will consider the exposition I gave you last evening, of a different doctrine taught by Moses, the Psalmists, the Prophets, John the Baptist, Jesus Christ himself and his Apostles in their sermons, as recorded in the book of Acts. If this doctrine be true, it rests mainly, if not wholly, upon the authority of a few passages, which are found in the epistles, in the arguments of Paul and Apollos, to persuade their countrymen, the Jews, to accept the gospel in all its simplicity, instead of the law and the Ritual of Moses.

I gave you, the last evening we were together, what I believe to be the clue to the right exposition of all those passages. You cannot appreciate its applicability unless you will study the Scriptures.

As to the text in Isaiah llii. 5, "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed." I need only say, that these words have an obvious signification, which is perfectly consistent with my ideas of the efficacy of the sufferings and death of Christ. "Surely," as the prophet says in the preceding verse, "he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows."

That Matthew understood this language in the same sense that I do, is very apparent to me from the language in which he quotes this sentiment. Matthew viii. 17, "Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." Here, I think that the intimation is plain enough that, as a physician of the body, while he sympathises with the sufferings of his patients, by his skill in the use of remedies and a proper regimen, may bear off from them their diseases—so Christ, the physician of the soul, by his prescriptions to a wounded conscience, and the spiritual regimen he prescribes, will bear away from those who follow his instructions, the sins which are the infirmities and sicknesses of the soul.

In our Daily Journal, of 10th of Jan. last, there was a very valuable article published on the Atonement, containing in the brief space which it occupied, a great deal of information on the rise and original meaning of this doctrine. I wish that article, or a somewhat more

extended one by the same writer might be published just now, in order to give you facts and hints, for which I have no room here.

The atonement ought to be the subject of a public discussion not less protracted, and more thorough, than this has been.

The great error of the whole orthodox doctrine is that it implies, that the effects of Christ's suffering and death were wrought upon the mind of God, or upon the administration of his moral government; inducing him to show a mercy to men, which otherwise he could not have shown. Now all this goes plainly on the untenable supposition, that there was something in the disposition of the Heavenly Father, or the principles of his government, that needed to be *mollified*. Whereas all that is or ever was, or ever will be, in the way of man's reconciliation to God, ("who is kind even to the evil and unthankful" and "more ready to forgive our sins than we are to seek forgiveness,") is man's own wickedness, perverse disobedience. That removed, reconciliation with God ensues at once; for "he desireth not the death of a sinner but rather that he would turn to him and live."

Then it is for man's own good, that this repentance, this change of heart and character should be required of him and wrought in him. Escaping from the punishment of sin, is not half so much to be desired as escape from the sin itself, and all its horrid effects upon the soul. Our orthodox theologians seem to treat the sins of men against God very much as our lawyers treat the crimes of men against society. They labor on the one hand to convict an accused man that he may be *punished*; and on the other hand to procure his acquittal, that he may *escape punishment*. Now, if a man has committed a crime against society, and society regarded and treated every offender as he should be treated, then the best good, that could be done to the criminal himself, would be to ascertain his guilt, that he might be subjected to such a course of moral discipline, as would restore him to his own approbation and the confidence of his fellow men. Now this, which certainly is not done, and many say cannot be done, under human governments, can and will be done under the perfect government of God. Therefore there can be nothing in the consequences of sin here or hereafter so bad, so much to be dreaded *as the sin itself*. That is the sickness, the leprosy of the soul. That is it, that unfits us for the society of God and his angels. Now I hold that the great good which Christ came to do for men was *to cure them of their sins*. As Peter declared (Acts iii. 26) God sent his son Jesus Christ "to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." He can do us no higher good than this. To procure us a pardon, by paying some compensation to offended justice, while we are left still alienated from the right, and the God of righteousness, would be to confer upon us no substantial benefit.

No, my friends, St. Paul in his Epistle to Titus, has put this matter in a very much better light than my brother Lee. He there says

(chap. ii. 14) that Jesus Christ "gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

Yes, he gave *himself* for us, his whole life, his whole character; all the powers of his mind, all the affections of his heart were devoted to this great purpose; to exhibit to man the power and the beauty and blessedness of the law of perfect righteousness, from obedience to which none of us can be exempt, or should wish to be exempt; for it is that law which "rejoiceth the heart, and in the keeping of which, there are great rewards." It is in his life and death as a perfect exhibition of true righteousness, that we have the highest inducement, the most powerful influence to give ourselves wholly to God.

Many persons have wondered, and some have sneered that we Unitarians have put the Cross upon our Church. Sir, it has a great significance to us—a significance, which I fear is but little understood in the Christian world. It is the emblem of self-sacrifice; of entire self-abandonment to the service of God and humanity. That is the highest attainment of the human soul. That was the crowning grace of the character of Christ. The glory of the Cross is not yet appreciated. I was sorry to hear my brother Lee, last evening, speak so slightly of our Saviour's conduct in his last hours, and in the agony of dying. If Christ were God, his suffering in the garden, and his despairing cry from the Cross would be inexplicable, for God is incapable of suffering. Or if Christ's human nature was consciously united with the Deity, it would have been sustained as no uncompounded man could have been. It was because he was truly a man—because his sufferings were so real, and so exquisite, that they are adapted to make an impression upon kindred hearts, when looked at in their true light, and not through the cloudiness of a factitious theology. There was nothing like pusillanimity in the conduct of Jesus, as my friend Lee unhappily intimated. He had all the tenderness of a woman, united to the resolution o' a man. He shrank from suffering, but never from duty. Not a syllable escaped his lips to qualify the offence, which his truth had given to his enemies. He had no stoical pride, no iron will, no nerves of brass to defy the pains of death; but he had a faith in God, and a love of the truth, and a benevolent regard for man, which never faltered. He was true to the last, though his cry to God, intimated how extreme his sufferings were. O, my brother, it seems to me you have yet to learn *the significance of the Cross*.

Our Lord's entire disuse of his miraculous powers for his own aggrandizement, or even for the relief of his physical sufferings; his submission to the death of the Cross, more ignominious then, and more excruciating, than that of the gallows is now—a death which he might have avoided by a timely compromise of his principles, or a slight exertion of his miraculous power; the tenderness of his deportment towards his disciples; his loving remembrance of his mother; his prayer for the forgiveness of the miserable tools of power, who knew not

what they were doing when they nailed him to the cross ;—all these things in the midst of sufferings, that wrung from him the cry that has penetrated the heart of humanity eighteen hundred years after it was uttered,—all these circumstances together conspire to make the death of Jesus such a scene as the world has never witnessed, before or since—an example of perfect self sacrifice ! And the Cross, when rightly understood, is the symbol of that highest virtue of the soul. We have placed it on our Church as such ; hoping and praying that the remembrance of " Him crucified" may awaken in us a spirit like his.

We regard not the Cross as a memorial or substitute, that was offered for our obedience to the Heavenly Father, as a satisfaction to his justice for the violation of his laws. We do not wish a substitute, for we wish ourselves to become wholly conformed to God's will ; and if afflictions in this life and chastisements in the next are seen by our Heavenly Father to be needful for us, to bring us wholly into subordination to his righteous will, we dare not pray to be exempted from any thing, that may be needful to that end so devoutly to be wished. We do not wish any other being should interpose between us and our Heavenly Father, to offer him any satisfaction for our delinquencies. We know we cannot feel any satisfaction with ourselves until we have corrected whatever is amiss in us ; and we cannot see how a benignant, holy father can take any satisfaction in us, until we have become all he has made us capable of being. Now for my part, I hope and pray, that all God's various discipline may be continued through this life, and in the life to come, until he has brought us to be wholly reconciled to all his requirements ; and to find our highest delight in obedience to all his commands, and in laboring continually to accomplish all the purposes of his love.

Mr. Lee has endeavored to associate me in your minds with Theodore Parker. Of this I do not complain, though it had nothing to do with our argument. But why should Mr. Lee, and my orthodox neighbors generally, take it for granted that my theological opinions are coincident with Mr. Parker's, because I have invited him to preach in my pulpit, and have myself preached in his ? I have had the same friendly intercourse with Swedenborgian, Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian (or orthodox Congregationalist) ministers. They have preached in my pulpit, and I in theirs, yet I never heard the friendly intimation that Mr. May had become, or was becoming " evangelical," when either of these last named exchanges took place. Why is it, sir, that orthodox people are so much more ready to think evil than good of a man :

The ground of my great regard for Mr. Parker, personally, and of my ministerial intercourse with him and with some preachers of the different orthodox sects, has not been an agreement in our system of theological belief, so much as a mutual recognition of our right to differ in our interpretation of the Bible ; and still more, a similar appreciation of the great practical purposes of the gospel, and of the de-

mands of our Lord that are upon us all, to co-operate with him, and with one another, in the redemption of the world from ignorance, sin, and misery. When I consider the mental and moral darkness that is shut down upon a large portion of the children of men, and that overshadows many, even in the most enlightened communities in Christendom ; when I think of and see " the wrong and outrage with which earth is filled," I cannot, will not stop, to scrutinize the theological opinions of a man whom I see laboring generously to dispel the darkness, and to correct the wrong, before I give him my right hand of fellowship, if he is willing to take it.

I respect Theodore Parker because he is a man of great intellect and of wonderful acquisitions. I love him, because he consecrates so much of his knowledge, his genius, and his eloquence, to the cause of suffering, outraged humanity. I honor him because he is no respecter of persons—doth not regard the rich more than the poor. As Jesus, our pattern in all things, did, so does he assail, most frequently and fearlessly, " the high and lifted up" in Church and State, because the vices of the age, the giant sin of our times and nation, are entrenched behind their example and influence. He is hated, sir in Boston, as our Lord was in Jerusalem, not because of his heterodoxy in theology, I believe, so much as because of his exposure of the vices of the scribes and pharisees, and rulers of the people.

It has been told you by Mr. Lee, that in speaking of him once to Mr. Pinney, I called him a dear son of God. I had entirely forgotten that I had ever allowed myself to speak so extravagantly in his praise. And yet if I were called upon to name those of all the living men I know, who most deserve to be called the dear children of God, he would be one. I can think of few who should be put before him, or with him, in that denomination, except it be William Lloyd Garrison, and Gerrit Smith, and Wendell Phillips, and Henry Ward Beecher, and Horace Mann, and William H. Furness, and Elihu Burritt, and William H. Channing, aye, and Lucretia Mott, and Harriet Beecher Stowe, and Antoinette L. Brown, and Lucy Stone, and Deborah Dix, and Sallie Holley, and Abby K. Foster. Yes, yes, there are other precious souls, of both sexes whom it is my privilege to know and love, that deserve to be placed with these, but they are too numerous to mention now. They are devoting themselves to the cause of crushed humanity, and *that* is the cause of Christ, yes, that is the cause of Christ : not the sustaining of a system of dogmas, devised by men in the 4th or 5th centuries, which, if true, would not comfort the afflicted, nor clothe the naked, nor break the yoke of the enslaved.

I have been shocked at some of Mr. Parker's opinions, and sometimes offended at his way of stating truths, but, sir, when I see the tremendous blows he strikes at the foundation vices of the Church, the State, and society, I respect and love him, his opinions on some points notwithstanding. And his opinions, sir, let me add, are less shocking, less derogatory to God, less dis-

couraging to man, than the doctrines which are given us in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, and the Thirty-nine Articles and Creeds of the Episcopal Church; doctrines, which, if they should be intelligently read to the people, and enforced individually upon their reception, as the condition of continued membership, would empty those Churches apace.

When I first heard of you, brother Lee, it was as a man who had generously espoused the cause of the peeled and wretched slaves in our country. I heard of your battling manfully with the Goliah sin of our nation, that has well nigh subjugated to its base purposes the Church and the State, the religion and the politics of the country. I heard how faithfully you were dealing with that terrible iniquity, as you found it secreted and protected by the great Methodist organization, to which you then belonged. I learnt how nobly you, with a few other faithful ones, came out from that corrupted body, and set up an altar upon which you might, in godly sincerity, offer the daily sacrifice of prayer to the God of the oppressed. I honored you for your fidelity to the right.

Since you came to this city, I have heard of your kindnesses to the outcasts—the fugitives from our American despotism—how you have sheltered them under your roof, fed them at your table, and helped them on their way “to the land of the free and the asylum of the oppressed.” My soul has been drawn towards you as a good son of God.

I cared not much to know what your theological opinions might be, to enable me to form an estimate of your Christian character, so long as I could see the fruits of the spirit of charity in your life. And now that I have found, in the course of this discussion, what your opinions are; although they appear to me very unscriptural, very irrational, very inconsistent with themselves and self-contradictory, still I will not withdraw my confidence from you as a man and a Christian, so long as I see, that you abound in love and good works. And here, brother Lee, after all our disputing, is my right hand of fellowship if you are willing to receive it.

Mr. Lee said—I take your hand, and fellowship you as a man and a philanthropist, but I have no fellowship with your theology.

Mr. May—Nor I with yours! I suppose that your theology is just as unlike to mine, as mine is to yours.

(Then turning to the audience) he said: I thank you fellow citizens for your long-continued and patient hearing of what we have had to say. I have only to beg of you to read what we have said, and consider it well that you may understand; compare our doctrines and arguments with each other as impartially as you may be able, and both with the teachings of the Bible, and judge for yourselves, which of the two is nearer the right.

ERRATA.

On the 16th page, first column, 6th line, after the marks of quotation, read *Peabody's Lectures*.

Page 21, on the first column, half way down, should have been introduced a number of quotations given in “Wilson's Concessions of Trinitarians” from *Beausobre et L'Enfant*, *Dr. Wall*, *Dr. Campbell*, *Le Clerc*, all giving “the wisdom of God,” “the reason of God,” “the divine intelligence” as the meaning of the Logos. The quotations were copied, but accidentally not sent to the printer.

26 Page, second column, first line; instead of metomysing, read *metonymy*.

59 Page, first column, third line; instead of “otherwise,” it should be “both ways.”

72 Page, second column, in the tenth, twelfth and seventeenth lines, instead of “text” read *test*.“

130 Page, first column, 20th line, for “calumniated,” read *culminated*.

442531

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

48112548

BT113 .L44 1854
Lee, Luther, 1800-1889. cn
Discussion of the doctrine of the trini

BT
113
.L44
1854

Lee, Luther, 1800-1889.

Discussion of the doctrine of the trinity, between Luther Lee, Wesleyan minister, and Samuel J. May, Unitarian, minister. Reported by Lucius C. Matlack. Syracuse, N.Y., Wesleyan Book Room, 1854.

160 p. 23 cm.

1. Trinity—Controversial literature
I. May, Samuel J. (Samuel Joseph),
1797-1871 II. Matlack, Lucius C.,
reporter III. Title

442561

